LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA

UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

V. 13, 1861

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW:

EDITED FOR

The Alumni Association

OF

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE;

BY

REV. E. V. GERHART, D. D. AND REV. P. SCHAFF, D. D.

Neque enim quæro intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam.—*Anselm.*

VOL. XIII. 1861.

PUBLISHED FOR THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION
BY GEORGE B. RUSSELL, PITTSBURG, PA.

CHAMBERSBURG:
M. KIEFFER & CO.
1861.

STORAGE
205
R255

v.13,1861

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOL. XIII.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

NO I.

I. The Epistle to the Galatians Translated and Explained, ... 1

A specimen of a projected popular Commentary on the New Testament,

By Philip Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.

II. The Marvellous in Modern Times, - . 33

By Lewis H. Steiner, A. M , M. D., Frederick, Md.

III. English Versions of the Heidelberg Catechism, 71

IV. Our Alumni Association, ... 134

By the Rev. George B. Russell, A. M., Pittsburg, Pa.

V. Recent Publications, ... 151

NO. II.

I. Jesus and the Resurrection, . . . 169

By John W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.

II. The Early Introduction of Catechization in the Reformed Church, ... 191

By Henry Harbaugh, D. D., Lebanon, Pa.

III. The Antipodes, or the World Reversed, . 215

By Prof. William M. Nevin, A. M., Lancaster, Pa.,

IV. Animal Magnetism and Hypnotism, . . 238

By Lewis H. Steiner, A. M., M. D., Frederick, Md.

V. Notes on the Agamemnon of Aeschylus, . . 252

By Prof. G. J. Adler, A. M., New York.

VI. The Relation of the Holy Ghost to the Natural World, ... 265

By the Rev. Daniel Gans, A. M., Harrisburg, Pa.

VI. Slavery and the Bible, . . . 288

By Philip Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.

VII. Recent Publications, . . . 318

NO. III.

I. The Moral Character of Jesus Christ, or the Perfection of Christ's Humanity a Proof of His Divinity, ... 321

By Philip Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

II. THE DIVINING ROD, ... 374
By Lewis H. Steiner, A. M., M. D., Frederick, Md.

III. LITURGICAL WORSHIP, . . . 401
Translated from the German of John S. Kessler, D. D., by Cyrus V. Mays, A. B., Harrisburg, Pa.

IV. NOTES ON THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS, . 418
By Prof. G. J Adler, A. M., New York.

V. RELIGIOUS TRAINING; OR THE GOSPEL EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM, ... 449
By the Rev. Daniel Y. Heisler, A. M., Bethlehem, Pa.

VI. THE NATIONAL QUESTION, . . . 475
By Emanuel V. Gerhart, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.

VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS, ... 489

NO. IV.

I. THE TRUE CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY, . . 497
By the Rev. John J. Swander, Chillicothe, O.

II. THE PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: The Oldest and Worthiest Popular Orators, . . 513
From the German of Dr. Umbreit.
By the Rev. Samuel T. Lowrie, Alexandria, Pa.

III. TABLE MOVINGS AND SPIRIT RAPPINGS, . . 526
By Lewis H. Steiner, A. M., M. D, Frederick, Md.

IV. NOTES ON THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS, . 551
By Prof. G. J. Adler, A. M., New York.

V. MOHAMMEDANISM IN ITS RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY, 565
By Dr. Zachaeus Test, Mercersburg, Pa.

VI. THE COMING OF CHRIST, ... 572
By Prof. P. C. Sinding, New York.

VII. CATECHISMS, ... 579
By Henry Harbaugh, D. D., Lebanon, Pa.

VIII. HUMILITY THE BASIS OF MORAL GREATNESS, . 611
By Rev. Dr. Rauch, dec'd., edited by Emanuel V. Gerhart, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.

IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS, ... 626

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1861.

ART. I.—THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS TRANSLATED AND EXPLAINED.

A SPECIMEN OF A PROJECTED POPULAR COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT, BY P. S.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THE READERS OF THE EPISTLE.

Galatia or Gallograecia was a mountainous but fertile province in the interior of Asia Minor. It had its name from the Gallic or Celtic tribes (*Galatians, Gaul's, Celtics* are often used synonymously among the ancient writers) who, in connection with Germans on the left side of the Rhine (*Germani-cisrhenani*, sometimes included among the Gauls) crossed over to Asia by way of Thrace in the third century before Christ. There they mingled with Greeks (hence the name *Gallograeci*), but retained the partial use of their vernacular tongue which, according to Jerome, resembled the Germanic dialect of the region of Treves. After a period of warlike and independent existence they submitted A. D. 187 before Christ to the rule of the Romans. They were the first of the Celtic and Germanic races to whom the Gospel was preached. They are described by the ancient writers as a frank, warlike, impetuous, intelligent, and impressible, but unsteady, ostentatious, and vain people, strongly resembling the cognate French. Under this character they appear also in the epistle of St. Paul. They received him first with enthusiastic joy and kindness, but suffered themselves soon to be misled by false teachers. The principal cities of the province were Ancyra (declared the capital by Augustus), Tavium, and Pessinus. Their commerce attracted many Jews. In these places were no doubt the most important of the congregations to which the Epistle is addressed.

The apostle Paul came first to Galatia during his second great missionary journey, about the year 51, accompanied by Silas and Timotheus, and planted the seed of Christianity throughout the province. (Acts 16, 6. Comp. Gal. 1, 6–8 ; 4, 13, ff.) He was at that time suffering from bodily infirmity (Gal. 4, 13) in consequence of much fatigue, persecution, manual labor for

his support, and that mysterious affliction which he calls a thorn in the flesh. (2 Cor. 12, 7.) But the grace of God dwelling in him overcame all these obstacles, revealed its purity and power the more by its contrast to the weakness of nature, and carried the excitable hearts of the Galatians with irresistible force. They received the apostle who manifested such zeal and devotion in spite of sickness and pain, as an angel of God, yea even as Jesus Christ himself, and felt so grateful and happy, that they were ready if possible to sacrifice their eyes for the unspeakable gift of the Gospel. (Gal. 4, 14. 15.) Hence also his deep grief, when he heard soon afterwards of their apostacy to a false Gospel.

On his third missionary journey, A. D. 54 or 55, Paul paid a second visit to Galatia, and confirmed the congregations in the Christian faith, Acts 18, 23.

The majority of these congregations were no doubt converts from heathenism. This appears from chapter 4, 8. 9, where their former condition is described as one of ignorance concerning God, and as a service of false or unreal gods; also from the remark, 6, 12, that the Judaizing errorists constrained them to be circumcised, which implies that they were not circumcised before. Compare also 1, 16. 2, 9. 4, 12. 5, 23. 6, 12. 13. At the same time we must suppose from the analogy of the other congregations founded by Paul, that a number of the Galatian converts were originally Jews, who, according to Josephus, were numerous in Ancyra. This appears from Gal. 2, 15 ff. 3, 13. 3, 23–25. 4, 3, where the apostle, as a *Jewish* Christian, speaks of himself and his readers in a common plural. This explains also the more readily the frequent allusions of the Epistle to the Old Testament, and the allegorical interpretation of Sara and Hagar, chapter 4, 21–31. The congregations of Galatia were, therefore, like all the churches founded by Paul, of a mixed, yet predominantly Gentile Christian character. It was his practice to preach the Gospel first in the synagogue, and then through the medium of the proselytes of the gate, i. e., the God-fearing Gentiles or uncircumcised semi-Jews, who frequently attended the Jewish worship, to prepare the way for the conversion of the Gentiles.

§ 2. OCCASION, OBJECT, AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle was occasioned by the agitations of the Judaizing legalists and formalists who taught the necessity of circumcision and the whole Mosaic law for salvation (5, 2. 11, 12. 6, 12 ff.), and assailed the apostolic authority of Paul, the great champion of the opposite doctrine of salvation by free grace without the works of the law (1, 1, 11; 2, 14). They looked upon him as a dangerous innovator and revolutionist who never enjoyed the personal intercourse of Christ on earth and stood in an anomalous position outside of the regular college of the original twelve. Their Christianity was in all its essential features identical with the Jewish system, and would never have been able to convert the Gentiles. But their error fell in very naturally with the hereditary prejudices of the Jewish converts, especially those of the strict Pharisaic school. They appealed with great apparent force to the letter of the Old Testament which enjoins circumcision unconditionally upon all male members of Israel, to the practice of the Christian congregation at Jerusalem

which adhered to the Mosaic ritual as long as it consisted exclusively of Jewish converts, and to the authority of Peter and James who, however, had taken more liberal ground since the vision at Joppa and the conversion of Cornelius (Acts 10 and 11).

These errorists were defeated by the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15.). Nevertheless they continued their mischievious work in nearly all the congregations of Paul and tried to undermine his authority and influence. In Galatia they were particularly bold and succeeded so well among the inexperienced converts that the majority of them for the time being fell away from the liberty of the Gospel to the bondage of the law (1, 6. 3, 1. 3, 4, 9 ff. 21, 5, 2 ff. 7). This apostacy took place shortly after the second visit of Paul in Galatia (1, 6, "I marvel that you are *so soon* removed," etc.). But the false teachers had probably commenced their agitation before, since passages like 1, 9. 5, 3. 4, 16, seem to allude to previous *personal* warnings of the apostle against the same error.

The object of the Epistle, accordingly, was both apologetic and polemic. It is a personal and a doctrinal self-defence, and a refutation of the Judaizing heresy. To this are added appropriate exhortations.

The first part, chapter 1, 1–2. 14 is historical and personal, giving a resumé of the apostles career, partly confirmatory, partly supplementary to the narrative of the Acts, and justifying his office and authority from the direct call of Christ, the revelation of the Gospel doctrine made to him, and the testimony of the other apostles during the Council of Jerusalem.

In the second or doctrinal part, chapter 2, 15—4, 31, he defends his teaching, the free Gospel Christianity, in opposition to the slavish and carnal legalism of his opponents.

In the third or practical part, chapter 5 and 6 he exhorts the Galatians to hold fast to the evangelical liberty without abusing it, to study love, unity, and other Christian virtues, and concludes with a benediction.

§ 3. TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

The Epistle must have been written after the apostolic Council, a. 50, since this is alluded to in chapter 2, 1 ff., and after the year 51, when Paul paid his first visit to Galatia, Acts 16, 6. The passage, Gal. 4, 13: "Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the Gospel unto you at the first (former time)," points to a still later date, as it seems to presuppose a second personal visit, the one mentioned in Acts 18, 23, which took place in 54 or 55. On the other hand, however, the words "so soon," 1, 6, forbid us to bring the composition down much later than the year 56. To a similar conclusion we are led by a comparison of the Epistle to the Galatians with the Epistle to the Romans. They bear such a strong resemblance not only in particular passages, but in their whole scope and tenor, that we may safely assign them to the same period in the life of Paul. But there is strong internal evidence that the former was written before the latter, since it is the fresh and fervent emotional utterance of those great truths of sin and free grace, in their bold elementary outlines, which in the Epistle to the Romans are more fully developed in the form of a calm and systematized argument. The Epistle to the Romans we know to have been written at Corinth early in

the year 58, shortly before his fifth and last journey to Jerusalem. Consequently we are confined to the period between 56 and 58 for the composition of the letter to the Galatians.

As to the place of writing we are pointed either to Corinth, where the apostle spent part of the winter from 57 to 58, or to Ephesus, whither he proceeded after his second visit to Galatia, and where he tarried nearly three years from 54–57 (Acts 19, 1. 10). In either city he could easily get information as to the state of things in Galatia. The common subscription, "written from Rome," which is no part of the original text, can not be supported by any external or internal argument, and has, therefore, long since been given up by the best commentators as a mistake.

§ 4. CHARACTER AND GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle to the Galatians is the Magna Charta and bulwark of evangelical liberty against all forms of ancient and modern legalism and ceremonialism. It is the strongest plea for the doctrine of the free grace of God in Christ Jesus as the only and all-sufficient ground of our salvation; of justification by faith in distinction from all external works and rites; and of the direct relation and personal communion of the believer with Christ in opposition to all intervening obstacles.

The Epistle to the Romans carries out the same ideas, but more fully, in the form of a treatise, and in calm, objective statement, without direct opposition to Judaizing heretics, since at that time Paul had no personal connection yet with the Roman congregation.

The Epistle to the Galatians, on the contrary, was written under the influence of a deep commotion of feeling and with a holy indignation not so much against the person of his opponents, whom he never mentions by name, but against their false doctrine and intriguing conduct. It is polemical throughout, impetuous and overpowering, and yet affectionate and warning in tone. It strikes like lightning every projecting point that approaches its path, and yet undelayed by these zig zag deflexions, instantaneously attains the goal. Every verse breathes the spirit of the great and free apostle of the Gentiles. His earnestness and mildness, his severity and love, his vehemence and tenderness, his depth and simplicity, his commanding authority and sincere humility are here vividly brought before us in fresh and bold outlines. How severe and intimidating is the anathema, 1, 8. 9; how sharp and cutting the reproof, 3, 1-4. But nothing can be more touchingly affectionate, on the other hand, than his reference to the love and gratitude which the Galatians bore to him, 4, 12–15, and the assurance of his anxiety to be present with his "little children of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you." 4, 18–20.

The doctrinal meaning and significance of this Epistle, as well as that of the cognate Epistle to the Romans, was not fully appreciated till the time of the Reformation. In the hands of a Luther and Calvin it became a powerful weapon against the Judaizers of their age who wished to entangle the Church again in the yoke of bondage, and who made salvation to depend upon all sorts of outward observances rather than a living faith in Jesus Christ. In this Epistle we have to this day the divine right and divine seal of genuine

Protestantism against Romanism as far as this is a revival of Judaism, and denies to the Christian man that liberty "wherewith Christ hath made us free." But it is also, at the same time, an earnest protest against all pseudo-protestantism, which would abuse the evangelical freedom and pervert it into carnal licentiousness.

The genuineness of the Epistle to the Galatians is not supported by stronger outward evidence than most of the books of the New Testament. The first clear testimonies are found in the writings of Irenaeus, Clemens of Alexandria and Tertullian towards the close of the second century; the allusions in the apostolic fathers being somewhat indefinite and uncertain. But the internal arguments are so strong, the thoughts and the style from beginning to end are so thoroughly characteristic of St. Paul, that his authorship has never been denied, or even doubted. Only quite recently (1850) a half crazy hypercritic (Bruno Bauer) has stultified himself by declaring it to be a confused compilation from the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians, with such arguments as are entirely unworthy of a refutation. There is no man in the entire history of ancient Christianity who could have written such an original, vigorous, fresh, profound and authoritative epistle, except the great apostle of the Gentiles whose name it bears.

COMMENTARY.

CHAPTER I.

Contents: I. Address and Apostolic Greeting, 1–5. II. Expression of astonishment at the inconstancy of the Galatians, and solemn protest against every perversion of the Gospel, 5–10. III. The apostolical call and authority of Paul, 7–24.

I. ADDRESS AND GREETING.

V. 1–5.

The very address reveals the occasion of the epistle and the commotion of Paul 1) by the emphasis laid on his independent apostolic office and dignity, which had been called in question by the Judaizing errorists; 2) by the reference to the atoning death of Christ, which the Galatians practically undervalued in their legalistic tendency; and 3) by the doxology, v. 5, which indicates his fervent zeal for the glory of God in opposition to every overvaluation of human works.

1. Paul, an apostle, not of men, nor by man, but by Je-

V. 1 contains the text of the first two chapters, namely the divine mission and independent apostolic authority of Paul, which the Judaizers denied, but which is clearly proved by the following narrative and the testimony of the older apostles themselves.

"*not of men, nor by man.*" This indicates that Paul's apostleship is entirely independent of human origin (*of*), and of human instrumentality (*by*). The singular in the second case makes the exclusion of every human agency still stronger (by any man whatever), and forms at the same time the contrast to the following *Jesus Christ*, who is not a mere man. The office of the heretical teachers was purely human (of men, and by man); or rather they were intruders without any divine authority or human; the office of Luke, Mark, Timothy and other disciples of the apostles was divine in its origin, but mediated or conveyed through men. It belongs to the very idea of an apostle in the full and proper sense of the term that he be directly and personally called by Christ without the intervention of human agency. It is true P., together with Barnabas, had a regular commission from the church at Antioch (Acts 13, 1–3), but for a special work, not for his apostleship, to which he was appointed by the exalted Saviour himself on the way to Damascus (Acts 9, 15. 22, 17–21. 1 Cor. 9, 1). The Judaizers, in their

sus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead; 2. and all the brethren who are with me, unto the churches of Galatia. 3. Grace [be] to you and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ,

---

tendency to overrate external forms and secondary causes, laid too much stress upon the personal intercourse with Christ in the days of his flesh, and hence they were disposed either to declare Paul a pseudo-apostle, or at least to subordinate him to the twelve, especially to Peter and James. Every minister and teacher of the Church must have a divine call, either direct, or mediated through the church; without such call he can not expect the blessing of God to rest on his labors.

"*by Jesus Christ*" *By* includes here for brevity sake the instrumental and the more remote originating cause.—The immediate coördination of Christ with God the Father, and this in contrast with the preceding *men* and *man*, proves that the Apostle regarded the Saviour as a Divine being.

"*and God the Father*," i. e., not indiscriminately the Father of all men, but of Christ his only begotten Son, and of all believers who by regeneration become the children of God (comp. 4, 6. Rom. 8, 15. John 1, 13). God is *our* father because he is the Father (not simply of *Jesus Christ* which would place him on a par with us, but) of *our Lord* Jesus Christ. Comp. Rom. 15, 6. 2 Cor. 1, 3. 11, 31. Eph. 1, 3. 3, 14. 1 Pet. 1, 3.

"*who raised him*," etc. It was the risen Saviour who called Paul to the apostleship, who founded the Church and gave some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, comp. Eph. 4, 11.

V. 2. "*and all the brethren who are with me*," i. e., the companions and co-laborers of Paul, such as Silas, Timothy, Luke, Sosthenes, some of whom are expressly mentioned in the address of other Epistles, comp. 1 Cor. 1, 1. 2 Cor. 1, 1. Phil. 1, 1. Col. 1, 1. 1 Thess. 1, 1. 2. Thess. 2, 1. The word *all* seems to imply a considerable number. The reason, however, why he mentions others, is to be found simply in his strong sense of brotherly communion, and not in the desire to give additional authority and force to the exhortations of the Ep., which being the product of an infallible apostle, required no such help.

"*unto the churches of Galatia*." It was a circular epistle, like the epistle to the Hebrews, and that to the Ephesians. Hence the absence of individual greetings at the close. The mere mention of the name without those honorable epithets which he bestows upon other congregations, betrays his dissatisfaction with the Galatians.

V. 3. The apostolic salutation combining the Greek *charis* (grace) and the Hebrew *schalom* (peace) and infusing into both a Christian meaning. It forms a sentence for itself distinct from v. 1 and 2, which is simp-

4. who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father. 5. to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen.

---

ly the address or inscription. Comp. note to Rom. 1 : 7.

V. 4. P. holds up at onec before the Galatians, who were returning to the bondage of the law, the picture of the dying Saviour who fully accomplished our redemption so that we need not resort to any human means of salvation.

"*deliver*," lit. tear away, the expression used by the Lord of Paul's own deliverance, Acts 26, 17.

"*from this present evil world*," from the state and order of fallen nature where sin and death reign, or from the world which lies in wickedness (comp. 1 John 5, 19), in opposition to the higher supernatural order of the heavenly kingdom which commences even here on earth, (for he who believeth in Christ *hath* eternal life,) but which will fully reveal itself at the glorious appearance of Christ. The words contain an allusion to the Jewish distinction between "*this world*" and "*the world to come*," or the period before and the period after the appearance of the Messiah. But the sense of these terms is modified in the New Testament: the present world of temptation and trial goes to the second and glorious coming of Christ; and the future world commences here already in faith, but does not fully appear to sight till the consummation. The verse implies a sense of sadness and of longing after the glorious liberty of the children of God.

"*according to the will of God*," from which the whole plan and process of redemption proceeds, so that all the glory belongs to him, and not to man. The sacrifice of the Son was not forced, or even commanded by the Father, but strictly voluntary, as is implied in the preceding words: "Who gave himself for our sins," comp. John 10 : 18. It was the act of his free love in harmony with the eternal design of the Father, who "is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." (2 Peter 3, 9.)

"*and our Father*," who is at the same time our loving merciful Father, and who out of infinite love gave his Son for our salvation.

V. 5. The doxology in this place is likewise an indirect reproof of the Galatians for dividing the glory of our salvation between God and man. Similar doxologies flowing from an overwhelming sense of gratitude are frequent with Paul, in connection with the mention of the Christian salvation. Rom. 11, 36. 16, 26. Eph. 3, 21. 1 Tim. 1, 17.

2. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

V. 6–10.

Without any words of commendation and praise such as Paul uses in the introduction to his Epistles, even those to the Corinthians, he hurries vehemently with fresh indignation into his subject, by expressing his painful amazement at the speedy apostacy of his spiritual children, and entering his solemn protest against every perversion of the Gospel of Christ, whom alone he served in his ministry. Yet his deep emotion is more that of sorrow than of anger, and his pen cannot suppress the yearnings of a father towards his spiritual children, (Comp. 4, 19).

6. I marvel that you are so soon turning away from him who called you in the grace of Christ, unto a different Gospel : 7. which is not another, except that there are some who

---

V. 6. "*I marvel,*" a sharp rebuke in a mild word which challenges explanation, and intimates that better things were expected from the Galatians.

"*so soon*" after your conversion, which is alluded to in "who called you," etc., or after my second visit to you. In either case the word points to a comparatively early date of the epistle.

"*turning away.*" The Greek implies first that the apostacy was voluntary on their part, and hence their own guilt; secondly, that it was not yet completed, but still in progress, and hence might be arrested. (The passive rendering of the 6th v.: "that ye are so soon removed from," according to the Latin Vulgate, would transfer the guilt to the false teachers and soften the censure of the readers.)

"*from him,*" not Paul, but God the Father, from whom the call proceeds (comp. 1, 15. 1 Cor. 1, 9. 7, 15. 17. Rom. 8, 30. 9, 11. 24. 1 Thes. 2, 12. 1 Peter 1, 15. 2, 9. 5, 10).

"*in* (not *into*, as the C. V. has it, following the Vulgate) *the grace of Christ.*" The grace, i. e., the whole work of Christ as a manifestation of his redeeming love, is both the element in which, and the medium through which, the Father draweth the Son (John 6, 44) and effects the call (comp Acts 15, 11. Rom. 5, 15).

"*unto a different Gospel,*" which is undeserving of the name, since there is but one Gospel, viz : that to which you were called by God. Hence Paul immediately adds a correction of this paradoxical expression which he uses simply in accommodation to the language of the Judaizing pseudo-evangelists. Com. 2 Cor. 11, 4.

V. 7. "*which* (pseudo-gospel of the heretical teachers) *is no other,*" i. e., no gospel, or glad tidings of salvation at all, but a perversion and corruption of the one Gospel. The Gospel of Paul teaches that man is justified by grace alone through faith in Jesus Christ; the pseudo-gospel of the Juda-

trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. 8. But even though I myself, or an angel from heaven should preach unto you the Gospel contrary to what we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. 9. As we said before, so say now again: If any man preach unto you the

---

izers teaches that man is justified by grace and works through faith in Christ and the circumcision of Moses. The former makes good works the effects, the latter the cause of justification, and is thus in fact a relapse into the Jewish standpoint under a Christian name.

V. 8. It is impossible to express more strongly and solemnly the conviction of the unerring truth of the Gospel as preached by Paul, the zeal for its purity, and the aversion to every heresy. Only an inspired apostle could thus speak. The condemnation of the opponents is indirect, but the more certain by the argument *a fortiori*. The severity of Paul against *false* brethren was only equalled by his forbearance with *weak* brethren. Comp. Rom. 14, 1 and 15, 1 ff. All personal assumption and arrogance is here excluded the more as he conditionally includes himself ("*we*") in the anathema. His only motive was zeal for the purity of the Gospel of his divine Lord and Master.

"*an angel from heaven*," proverbial expression for a being possessed of the highest authority next to the divine.

"*contrary to*," lit. "beyond what," which is both *beside* (*praeterea*) and *against* (*contra*), and condemns not indeed the mere difference in form such as it existed even among the apostles themselves, but every material alteration of the Gospel either by perversion, or omission, or such addition as contradicts the spirit of apostolic teaching. The Judaizers did not indeed formally deny the doctrine of justification by faith, but they indirectly undermined it by adding the assertion of the coördinate necessity of circumcision, just as the Pharisees professed to hold fast to the Word of God in the Old Testament, and yet made it of none effect by their human traditions. (Comp. Mark 7, 13.)

"*accursed*" (anathema= anathematized), i. e., given over to the judgment of God. Comp. 1 Cor. 16, 22: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema;" also Gal. 3, 13. 5, 10. Rom. 9, 4. 1 Cor. 12, 3. Subsequently the idea of ecclesiastical excommunication was attached to this term; but in our case the mention of an angel forbids this reference.

V. 9. "*before*," refers not to v. 8, which is too near, but to the last visit of Paul to Galatia.

"*preach*" implies the actual fact, not the mere possibility as the hypothetical "*should preach*," v. 8, and thus attacks

Gospel contrary to what you have received, let him be accursed. 10. For am I now persuading men, or God? Or am I seeking to please men? For if I were yet pleasing men, I were not a servant of Christ.

---

more directly the Galatian pseudo-apostles.

V. 10, accounts for and thus softens the apparently excessive severity of the preceding condemnation. The service of the Gospel is absolutely irreconcilable with the *selfish* service of men. We should indeed not seek our own, but serve our fellow-men, (comp. Rom. 15, 1–3) but for God's sake, and the promotion of his glory.

"*persuading*," trying to conciliate or to gain favor by persuasion.

"*get*," i. e., after my call to the apostleship, and all that has happened to me. This does not necessarily imply that in his former natural state he was a pleaser of men, and sought the favor of the Jews when he persecuted the Christians. For a certain manly independence and fearless regard to duty seems to have characterized him even before his conversion.

"*I were not a servant of Christ*," in the proper sense of the term, as described with such power and beauty, 1 Cor. 4, 9–13; 2 Cor. 11, 23, sqq. It is opposed to such unworthy servants as the Galatian heretics, who under this assumed character sought not the glory of Christ and the salvation of souls, but only the favor of men and their own profit. Hence the Greek fathers miss the meaning if they explain: I would not have left Judaism and become a Christian.

3. APOSTOLICAL CALL AND AUTHORITY OF PAUL.

V. 7-24.

Paul now enters upon his apology. He defends first his independent apostolical dignity, v. 7 to 2, 11, and proves that he was called directly by Christ, that he received his Gospel through revelation, before he became even acquainted with the older apostles, and that he was recognized by them in his independent apostleship at the conference of Jerusalem. These allusions to important facts in his former life tend partly to confirm, partly to complete the account of the Acts concerning his conversion, his relation to the other apostles, and the council of Jerusalem, and are, therefore, of great value for a biography of Paul.

11. For I make known to you brethren, that the Gospel preached by me is not according to man. 12. For neither did I receive it from man, nor learn [it], but through revelation of Jesus Christ.

V. 11. "*according to man.*" The Gospel is divine in origin, contents, and the mode of its communication to Paul, but intended for man, and satisfying the deepest wants of man's nature.

V. 12. "*neither did I,*" any more than the elder apostles. The opponents denied the equality of Paul with the original twelve on that score, hence the *neither.*

"*receive*" signifies the passive, "*learn,*" the active or cöoperative mode of appropriation. The former refers more to historical, the latter to doctrinal knowledge.

"*through revelation of* (from) *Jesus Christ,*" especially on the way to Damascus, Acts 9, 3 ff. This was the fundamental and central illumination of Paul, which was followed by special revelations at different periods of his life. Comp. Acts 22, 17. 23, 11. 1 Cor. 11, 13. 2 Cor. 12. 1 ff. Gal. 2, 2. He speaks of the abundance of his revelations. Thus St. Peter, also, after Pentecost, received the vision at Joppa, Acts 10, which enlightened him concerning the exact relation of the Gospel to the Gentiles, and hence thus marked a progress in his inspired knowledge. Revelation is distinguished from ordinary illumination and instruction by its divine origin, its elevation above (not against) reason and its sudden communication and intuitive perception. Paul does not mean here the outward historical information concerning the life of Christ, but the internal exhibition of Christ to his spiritual sense as the Messiah and the only and all-sufficient Saviour of the world, and the unfolding of the true import of his death and resurrection, in other words the spiritual communication of the Gospel system of saving truth as taught by him in his sermons and epistles.

13. For ye heard from my former conversation in Judaism, how that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God, and labored to destroy it, 14. and surpassed in Judaism many of my age in my nation, being far more zealous for the traditions of my fathers. 15. But when it pleased God who set me apart from my mother's womb, and called me

---

V. 13. "*ye heard*" from myself when I was among you.

"*Judaism*," the Jewish religion and mode of thought and action.

"*labored to destroy*," not simply *wasted*. It was the intention of Paul, to annihilate Christianity, he was actually engaged in the attempt, and carried it out as far as he could. Comp. Acts 12, 4. 9. 1, 21. 26, 10. 11.

V. 14. "*tradition*," the law of Moses together with the explanations and additions of the Pharisees which concealed rather than unveiled the word of God and either prevented or destroyed its direct effect, comp. Mark 7, 3. 13. Matth. 5, 21. 15, 2. Paul belonged to the sect of the Pharisees, Acts 23, 6. The word *tradition* (Gr. paradosis) which figures so prominently in the Roman Catholic controversy, in the general sense embraces every thing which is taught and handed down either orally or in writing or in both ways from generation to generation; in the particular sense it may be used favorably of the divine doctrine and even of Christianity itself as is the case 1 Cor. 11, 2 (where the C. Vers, translates *ordinances* for *traditions*), 2 Thess. 2, 15; 3, 6, or unfavorably of the human additions to, and peversions of the religion of the Old or New Testament, in which case it is generally more clearly defined as the traditions *of the elders* or the traditions *of men*, as Matth. 25, 2. Mark 7, 3. 5, 8. Col. 2, 8. In our passage it means the whole Jewish religion or mode of worship divine and human, but in the pharisaic sense as opposed to Christianity or the tradition of the Gospel. In the controversy with Rome it is therefore always necessary first to come to a proper understanding as to the meaning of tradition.

V. 15. Comp. Jerem. 1, 5: "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee and ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." Isai. 49, 1: "The Lord hath called me from the womb, from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name." The decree of redemption is eternal as God's love and omniscience (comp. Eph. 1, 4), but its temporal realization begins in each individual case with the natural birth, and more properly with the Gospel call and the spiritual birth. Paul renounces here every merit of his own, and gives all glory to God. He refers, however, here more particularly to his call to the *apostleship*, for which he was

by his grace, 16. to reveal his Son within me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles, immediately I did not confer with flesh and blood, 17. nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but I went away into Arabia, and returned again to Damascus. 18. Then

---

"*set apart*," or destined, elected and dedicated by a divine act. (Com. the same term. Rom. 1, 1. Acts 13, 2, and the corresponding Hebrew verb *hiphdil* used of the separation and dedication of the priests and levites to the service of God, Numb. 8, 14. 16, 9. 1 Chron. 23, 13.)

V. 16, "*within me*," in my inmost soul and consciousness. The appearance of Christ on the way to Damascus, although perceptible to the senses, was mainly intended for the inner man. ("*to reveal*" depends on "pleased," not on "called.")

"*among the Gentiles*;" comp. Acts 9, 15. 22, 21. 26, 17. 18. Rom. 11, 13. Eph. 3, 8. Paul addressed himself first to the Jews, but this was merely the natural and divinely appointed bridge to the conversion of the heathen.

"*immediately*" is properly connected with "I went away," v. 17, and the negative clause is interposed. It does not contradict the statement, Acts 9, 20, that Paul preached immediately after his conversion, in Damascus; for this was simply a short testimony to his faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, while he did not enter upon the actual duties of the apostleship till several years later.

"*with flesh and blood*," comp. Matth. 16, 17. Eph. 6, 12. Paul means here not his own corrupt nature, which rebelled against the divine grace, but other weak men, since his object here is to prove his entire independence on human counsel and instruction. Ananias it seems did no more than baptize and lay his hands on him, comp. Acts 9, 15–19.

V. 17. He did not even seek instruction from the apostles, to whom he concedes no other preference but the priority of call.

"*into Arabia*," probably that part of the Arabian desert which nearly bordered on Damascus, and which at that time had not yet been visited by Christian missionaries. We are not informed as to the object of this retirement; but it would seem that Paul intended not so much to preach the Gospel there as to prepare himself, by prayer, fasting, reading of the Old Testament, and meditation, for the duties of his apostleship. Hence we may easily account for the silence of the Acts (9, 23) concerning this journey to Arabia; for Luke confines himself to the public labors of Paul.

V. 18. This first visit to Jesus after Paul's conversion coincides with that mentioned in Acts 9, 25, and took place A. D. 40. The "*three years*" must be reckoned from his conversion in 37.

after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to make the acquaintance of Cephas, and remained with him fifteen days. 19. But I saw no other of the apostles, except James the

---

"*to make the (personal) acquaintance of Cephas,*" not to receive instruction or direction from him. The fact that he wished to see Peter more than any other apostle, implies the superiority of the latter over the twelve, but not over him, since his very object in this entire passage is to show the absolute independence of his apostleship, and since, in 2, 11 ff., he relates that he even publicly reproved Peter at Antioch, which would be incompatible with the position and duty of an inferior.

"*Cephas,*" not "*Peter,*" is the reading of the best critical authorities throughout this Epistle and the Epistle to the Corinthians, except in the passage, Gal. 2, 7. 8. This Syro-Chaldaic form of his name was the one actually given him by Christ, (John 1, 43), and naturally adhered to by the Judaizers. It was perhaps in silent opposition to them that Peter in his epistles used the Greek form.

"*fifteen days,*" i. e., too short a time to become a disciple of Peter. The reason of his short stay at Jerusalem, was the persecution of the Greek Jews, Acts 9, 29, and the express command of the Lord to go to the Gentiles, 22, 17 ff.

V. 19. "*James,*" not the elder, St. John's brother, who was beheaded in 44, (Acts 12, 2), but the same who, after the departure of Peter from Palestine (12, 17) presided over the congregation of Jerusalem (15, 13. 12, 18) and is frequently called by the church fathers "bishop of Jerusalem." The word "*except,*" or "save," "but" does not compel us to number him with the apostles proper and to identify him with James the younger, who was also called James the son of Alpheus; but it intimates rather, in connection with what precedes, and with his characteristic title here given him, that although not belonging to the Twelve, he was nevertheless, like Barnabas, an apostle in the wider sense, i. e., a man, who, owing to his character, position and relationship to the Lord, enjoyed apostolical authority.

"*the brother of the Lord,*" not cousin (for which Paul has the proper expression, Col. 4, 10), but either a younger son of the Virgin Mary (comp. Matth. 1, 25, where Jesus is called the *first* born of Mary, which, however, does by no means *necessarily* imply that she had children after him), or what appears more probable, a son of Joseph from a previous marriage, and hence a step-son of Mary and a step-brother of Jesus, according to the flesh. Comp. on the brothers of the Lord (James, Joses, Simon and Judas) Matth. 12, 46. 13, 55. John 7, 3–10. Acts 1, 14. The

brother of the Lord. 20. Now what I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not. 21. Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia; but I was unknown by face to the churches of Judea which are in Christ: 23. They only heard that he who once persecuted us is now preaching the faith which he once labored to destroy. 24. And they glorified God in me.

James of our epistle (2, 9. 12) is at all events the same who in the Acts 12, 17. 15, 13. 21 appears at the head of the church at Jerusalem, and who by the ancient writers is called "bishop of Jerusalem, also "the Just."

V. 20. This solemn asservation refers simply to the statement v. 18 and 19, and justifies the inference that his Judaizing opponents spread the report in Galatia that Paul had spent a much longer time in Jerusalem and was instructed by the Jewish apostles, especially Peter, consequently dependent on them.

V. 21. Comp. Acts 9, 30. "*Syria,*" not Phoenicia, as some suppose, but Syria proper with the capital of Antioch. "*Cilicia,*" the native province of Paul, adjoining Syria. The object of this journey was no doubt to preach the Gospel, as appears from v. 23 and from Acts 15, 23, where churches are mentioned in these regions.

V. 22. "*by face,*" by sight, personally. The congregation of Jerusalem must be excepted; for there he was known from his visit mentioned in v. 18, and from his former life when he studied with Gamaliel and persecuted the Christians.—Comp. also Acts 9, 26–30.

V. 24. "*in me,*" in my case, or example, not on my account. This truly Christian conduct of the Jewish converts in Palestine contrasts very favorably with the envy and calumny of the Judaizers in Galatia.

CHAPER II.

I. Conference of Paul with the elder apostles at Jerusalem, v. 1–10. II. Collision of Paul with Peter at Antioch, v. 11–21.

I. CONFERENCE OF PAUL WITH THE JEWISH APOSTLES AT JERUSALEM.

v. 1–10.

This is the immediate continuation of the personal defence commencing 1, v. 11. Fourteen years after his conversion Paul had an interview with the apostles of the circumcision at Jerusalem concerning his Gospel, and was recognized by them as an independent, divinely appointed apostle of the Gentiles.

Which journey to Jerusalem does Paul here refer to? This is the preliminary question to be settled in the interpretation of this difficult section. The Acts mention five such journeys after his conversion, viz: 1) 9, 23 (comp. Gal. 1, 18), the journey of the year 40, three years after his conversion. 2) 11, 30. 12, 25, the journey during the famine in 44. 3) 15, 2, the journey to the apostolic council in 50 or 51. 4) 18, 22, the journey in 54. 5) 21, 15 (comp. Rom. 15, 25ff.), the last visit, on which he was made a prisoner and sent to Caesarea, in 58.

Of these journeys the first, of course, cannot be meant, on account of Gal. 1, 18. The second is excluded by the chronological date in 2, 1. For as it took place during the famine of Palestine and in the year in which Herod died, A. D. 44, it would put the conversion of Paul back to the year 30, which is much too early. Some proposed to read four instead of fourteen, but without any critical authority whatever. There is no necessity why Paul should have mentioned this second journey, since it was undertaken simply for the transmission of a collection of the Christians at Antioch for the relief of the brethren in Judea, and not for the purpose of conferring with the apostles on matters of dispute. In all probability he saw none of them on that occasion, since in that year a persecution raged in which James the elder suffered martyrdom, and Peter was imprisoned. The fifth journey can not be meant, as it took place after the composition of the Epistle to the Galatians and after the dispersion of the Apostles. Nor can we think of the fourth, which was very short and transient (Acts 18, 21. 22), leaving no time for such important transactions as are here alluded to; nor was Barnabas with him on that occasion, having separated from Paul some time before (Acts 15, 39).

We must therefore identify our journey with the third one mentioned in the 15th chapter of Acts. For this took place in 50 or 51, i. e., fourteen years after his conversion (37), and was occasioned by the important controversy on the authority of the law of Moses and the exact relation of the Gentile converts to the Christian Church (Acts 15, 2). This visit Paul could not possibly pass over, as it was of the greatest moment to his argument. It is

true our passage differs somewhat from the account given by the Acts. But the difference is not irreconcilable. Luke, in keeping with the documentary character of his historical narrative, gives us only the public transactions of the Council at Jerusalem; Paul shortly alludes to his personal conference and agreement with the apostles (see note to verse 2); both together give us a complete history of that remarkable convention, the first Synod in Christendom, for the settlement of the first doctrinal and practical controversy which agitated the Church.

1. Then, fourteen years after, I again went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus with me also. 2. And I went up by revelation, and laid before them the Gospel

---

V. 1. The fourten years of independent apostolical labor are not to be reckoned from the journey last mentioned, 1, 18, but from the conversion, this being the great turning point in the life of Paul, 1, 15. As this probably took place A. D. 37, we would have the year 50 or 51 for the apostolic conference here referred to, a date which is confirmed by other chronological hints and combinations. The second journey to Jerusalem, on a purely benevolent mission during the famine of 44 (Acts 11, 30. 12, 25), when he probably saw none of the apostles on account of the recent persecution, is omitted as irrelevant to the point here at issue. After my conversion, he means to say, I had the following opportunities of conferring with the apostles: 1) three years afterwards I went to Jerusalem, and saw Peter for fifteen days; 2) after fourteen years I went to Jerusalem again and had a special conference with the chief apostles. But in neither case was I instructed or commissioned by them; on the contrary they recognized me as the independent, divinely appointed apostle of the Gentiles.

"*Titus*" is not mentioned by Luke, as in fact nowhere in the Acts, but is included in the "*others*," Acts 15, 2, who accompanied Paul and Barnabas. Being an uncircumcised convert and a living testimony of the efficient labors of Paul among the Gentiles, he was peculiarly suited for the object of this journey.

V. 2. "*by revelation*," or in consequence of a revelation or divine monition, (comp. Acts 16, 6. 7. 19, 21. 20, 22. 23. 22, 17. 27, 23. 2 Cor. 12. 1). This was the inward, personal motive. The author of Acts, 15, 2, while he omits this, mentions the external, public occasion, the appointment by the church of Antioch, which sent him and Barnabas as delegates to represent the interests of Gentile Christianity. So Peter, according to Acts 10, was prompted both by a vision and by the messengers of Cornelius to go to Caesarea.

"*before them*," the Christians at Jerusalem (v. 1), the whole congregation. This implies a public transaction in open coun-

which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to those of chief reputation, lest perchance I should be running, or have run in vain. 3. Yet not even Titus, who was with

---

cil, which is described in the Acts. The reason why Paul does not mention the action of the council, but confines himself to an account of the private and personal agreement with the leading apostles, must be sought in the fact that the decision and pastoral letter of the Council (Acts 15, 22 ff.) had already been personally communicated by Paul to his churches (16, 4). But it was no doubt interpreted by the Judaizing teachers in a sense contrary to the meaning of the chief apostles, and hence the importance of referring to their personal understanding with Paul.

"*privately,*" in separate meetings as distinct from the public discussions. Such private conferences are always held in connection with public assemblies, ecclesiastical, literary and political, for the purpose of preparing and maturing the business for the final action of the body.

"*those of chief reputation,*" or the leading men who enjoyed the greatest authority among the Jewish Christians. He means James, Peter and John, as appears from v. 9. Similar is the expression "the very chiefest apostles," 2 Cor. 11, 5. 12, 11. It seems to imply a slight tint of irony, especially as used in v. 6. But the blame is, of course, not intended for the apostles themselves, whose testimony in his favor it is his purpose here to relate, and whom he always treated with fraternal esteem and love, but for the Judaizers who unduly exalted them above Paul. He feels himself equal to them before men, and yet in his deep humility before God he calls himself the least of the apostles and unworthy of the high name, because he persecuted the church of God, 1 Cor. 15, 9.

"*lest perchance,*" etc., lest my apostolic labors past and present should be fruitless, not in themselves considered and in my estimation, but in the judgment of the bigotted among the Jewish Christians. Besides the non-recognition of the Gentile churches by the mother churches of Jerusalem, would really have interfered with the progress of his mission and unsettled many of his weaker converts, as the example of the Galatians shows. The expression "*run*" is taken from the image of a race to which the Christian life is frequently compared, Phil. 2, 16. 2 Tim. 4, 7. 1 Cor. 7, 24. f. Gal. 5, 7. Heb. 12, 1.

V. 3. Far from declaring my labors fruitless and disapproving my Gospel, the Jewish apostles did not force even Titus, my companion and colaborer, much less the body of the

me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised; 4. and that on account of the false brethren foisted in among us, who crept in to spy out our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage. 5. To whom we yielded, by subjection, not even for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might abide

---

Gentile converts, to submit to circumcision which the Judaizing party peremptorily demanded as a condition of justification (as appears from v. 4 and 5 and Acts 15, 5).

V. 4. "*and that,*" viz: he was not compelled by the chief apostles to be circumcised. This explains and qualifies the general assertion, v. 3, and intimates that under other circumstances, if no principle had been involved, the Jewish apostles might have recommended the circumcision, as an act of prudence, or for peace sake. So Paul himself, after the apostolic council, circumcised Timothy (Acts 16. 3), without any inconsistency (comp. 1 Cor. 7. 18 f.). For he did this from his own impulse, without outward pressure, and for the purpose of making him more useful in the synagogue, without compromising his principle of justification by faith without the works of the law. It must be remembered also that Timothy was a Jew from his mother's side, and that therefore the Jews had a certain right to claim him, while Titus was a pure Gentile by birth. It is possible, however, to take v. 4 as an independent, though grammatically irregular sentence in this way: "The elder apostles did not insist on (but simply recommended) the circumcision of Titus (v. 3). But when the false brethren, i. e., the Judaizers, insisted upon it, we did not yield to them for a single hour."

"*foisted in,*" brought in by unfair means. These Judaizers were formerly Pharisees, as appears from Acts 15, 5, and were so still in spirit, although they professed Christianity by the mouth and were baptized. From these *false* brethren we should carefully distinguish the *weak* brethren whom Paul treats with great indulgence, comp. Rom. 14, 1, ff. 15, 1–3.

"*to spy out,*" how far we observed the Mosaic ordinances or violated them.

"*our freedom,* from the bondage of the law.

"*in Christ Jesus,*" in living union with him who is the end of the law (Rom. 10, 4). This is the positive side of freedom. Out of Christ there is no true freedom, but slavery of sin, comp. 5, 1–12; John 8, 32–36.

V. 5. These false brethren, it must be remembered, required circumcision and the observance of the whole ceremonial law not only from the Jewish, but also from the Gentile Christians, and that not only as an old venerable custom, but as a necessary condition to salvation. Paul and his companions

with you. 6. But from those who are held in chief reputation (whatever they once were, it makes no difference to me, God regards not the person of man)—for those of chief reputation gave me no new instruction.

---

could, therefore, not yield to them for a moment *by subjection*, viz: to the law of circumcision, so as to circumcise Titus according to their demand. He could here not become a Jew to the Jews in order to gain them (1 Cor. 9, 20–22), as in such cases where the truth was not jeopardized, and where subjection was simply a matter of charity for the sake of peace. Submission in this case would have been treason to the fundamental truth of the Gospel that Christ is the only and sufficient source of salvation, and a wanton sacrifice of the sacred rights and liberty of the Gentile Christians.

V. 6. "*for those who are held in chief reputation*," literally "those who have the estimation of being something," i. e., something great, extraordinary, "pillars" of the church (comp. v. 9). It refers not to their own conceit, but to the high estimate in which they were held, especially by the Judaizing Christians, who even overestimated them at the expense of Paul. As in v. 2, he means here James, Peter and John, as appears from v. 9. The sentence is somewhat irregular. We expect the verb: "I received no additional instruction, or correction." But the parenthesis causes a change of construction at the end of the verse. (The interpretation: "As regards those who were, etc., it matters not to me," and the other: "Of those, etc., I do not differ," would avoid the grammatical irregularity, but both are grammatically incorrect.)

"*once*," i. e., either at the time of the conference here spoken of, or during the earthly life of Christ. In the latter case it would refer to the personal intercourse of the older apostles with Jesus, which was unduly urged by the Judaizers as a decided advantage above Paul. But Paul, without intending any disrespect towards his colleagues, represents this as having no weight, where the truth of the Gospel is concerned, God being no respecter of persons, and dealing with the strictest impartiality. His high sense of independence far from being identical with pride, rested in his humility; it was but the complement to the feeling of his absolute dependence upon God.

"*for those*," I say,—reasumption of the unfinished sentence in an another form, instead of: "From those of chief reputation —I received no new instruction."

"*gave me no new instruction*," added nothing to my exposition of the Gospel (v. 2), but were satisfied with it and with my mode of converting the Gentiles. (Others explain: laid

7. But on the contrary when they saw that I am intrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as Peter [with that] of the circumcision 8. (for he who gave strength to Peter for the apostleship of the circumcision, gave strength to me also for the Gentiles), 9. and when they knew the grace given to me, James, Cephas, and John who are re-

---

no *additional* burden on me, viz: the ceremonial law; but they laid no burden on him at all.)

V. 7. "*when they saw*" from the communications of Paul (v. 2) and the abundant results of his missionary labors among the Gentiles (Acts 15, 12).

"*that I am intrusted;*" the commission and trust being still in active force. Paul was directed to the field of heathen missions at his first call, Acts 9, 15, and more clearly by a special revelation in the temple of Jerusalem, 22, 17–21. Yet the division of labor was not absolute and exclusive. For Paul generally commenced to preach in the synagogue because it furnished the most convenient locality and the natural, historical connection for the announcement of the Gospel, and because it was resorted to by the numerous proselytes who formed the bridge to heathen missions (comp. Acts 13, 5. 46. 14, 1. 18, 6. Rom. 1, 16. 9, 1. 3). On the other hand, Peter, though he was then, and continued to be, the head of the Jewish Christian branch of the apostolic Church, opened the door for the conversion of the Gentiles by the baptism of Cornelius (Acts 10, 11 and 15, 7), and his epistles show that in his later years he did not confine himself to the circumcision, for the congregations to which they are addressed, were of a mixed character and partly founded by Paul.

V. 8 is a parenthetic explanation of v. 7.

"*gave strength,*" enabled them successfully to discharge the duties of the apostolic office, by conferring upon them the necessary spiritual gifts and qualifications and accompanying their preaching with signs and miracles (comp. Rom. 15, 18. 19. 2 Cor. 12, 12).

"*for the Gentiles*"—for the apostleship of the Gentiles.

V. 9. "*grace*" implies here the call, the spiritual outfit and the success, all of which Paul regards as a free unmerited gift of God in Christ, as he says, 1 Cor. 15, 10: "By the grace of God I am what I am; and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain; but I labored more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me."

"*James*" (1, 19) is, according to the best manuscripts, named first, because he presided at that time over the con-

garded to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we [should preach the gospel for] the Gentiles, and they for the circumcision: 10. provided only that we should remember the poor, the very thing which I also diligently endeavored to do.

---

gregation of Jerusalem, and perhaps also over the apostolical council, or at all events exerted the controlling influence there and led to the final decision, Acts 15, 13 ff.

"*pillars*," i. e., principal supporters, leading men, chief champions of the Church, which is often represented as a temple, 1 Cor. 5, 16. Eph. 2, 21. 1 Tim. 3, 15. Rev. 3, 12. But the expression is used in the same sense in all languages without metaphor. Paul does not deny his colleagues first mentioned to be the leading apostles of the Jews; they were so still in fact as he was the pillar of the Gentile Church; but the Judaizers used the expression no doubt in an envious party sense and with the view to depreciate Paul (comp. v. 6 note).

"*the right hands of fellowship.*" This fact, based, as it was, on sincere esteem and love, refutes the conclusion which a few modern critics have derived from this chapter concerning a serious discord between the apostles of the Jews, and those of the Gentiles. They differed widely, no doubt, in talent, temperament, and field of labor, but they agreed in spirit and principles, they were servants of the same Lord and organs of the same grace, and as they sought not their own glory, there was no room for envy and jealousy, which might have prevented them from extending to each other the hand of fraternal communion.

"*should preach the Gospel*," others supply "*should go.*"

V. 10. "*The poor*" of the Jewish brethren in Palestine, who suffered much from famine and persecution. Charity should thus not only afford temporal relief to the needy, but be a moral bond of union also between the Jewish and the Gentile branches of the Church, and furnish a proof of the gratitude of the Gentile Christians for the unspeakable gift of the Gospel which they received from the mother congregation at Jerusalem. Such a collection is mentioned already, Acts 11, 29 f., and was forwarded by the congregation of Antioch to the brethren in Judea through the hands of Paul and Barnabas during the famine of 44. On his third great missionary tour between 54 and 57, Paul raised large contributions in his congregations for the same purpose, and took them himself to Jerusalem on his fifth and last visit (1 Cor. 16, 1. 2 Cor. 8 and 9. Rom 15, 25. Acts 24, 17). In the intervening time other collections were made to which Paul here alludes, but which are not mentioned in the fragmentary accounts of the Acts.

"*diligently endeavored*," then and always; it was his habit, and hence the Judaizers had

no ground whatever to charge him with a breach of contract on that score. The exercise of Christian liberality and active benevolence for the support of the poor, domestic and foreign missions and all the general operations of the Church, is just as much a duty and ought to be just as steady a habit, as prayer, or any other exercise of piety.

2. THE COLLISION OF PAUL WITH PETER AT ANTIOCH.

Ch. II, 11–21.

Paul continues to prove his independent apostolic dignity and shows that he asserted it even in open opposition to Peter at Antioch before the mother congregation of Gentile Christianity, when the latter acted inconsistently with his own view on the proper ground of our justification before God. In v. 15 he passes from the personal and historical part to the doctrinal part, viz. the defense of his evangelical view of the way of salvation in opposition to the Judaizing legalism of the false teachers. The Acts make no mention of this controversy with Peter, but they relate a dispute between Paul and Barnabas (15, 36–40), which took place likewise at Antioch soon after the apostolic conference, and although referring mainly to a personal matter concerning Mark, was in all probability connected with the other dispute, inasmuch as Barnabas suffered himself to be led into a similar inconsistency by the example of Peter (2, 13).

The collision of the two apostles was of course only a temporary one. But it is instructive by showing first the perfect independence of Paul on Peter (against any undue elevation of the latter to an unapproachable and absolute superiority) ; secondly the right of protest against the highest ecclesiastical authority under certain circumstances; thirdly the duty to subordinate all favor of man to supreme regard for the truths of God; and fourthly the moral imperfection of the apostles even after the day of Pentecost. The weakness of Peter is here recorded both for the warning and for the comfort of believers. For if even Peter was led astray, how much more should we, ordinary Christians, be on our guard against temptation! But if even Peter found remission, we may confidently expect the same on the same condition of hearty repentance.

But the fact here related does not justify any unfavorable conclusion against the inspiration of the apostles and the infallibility of their writings. For Paul charges his colleague with hypocrisy or dissimulation, i. e., with action against his own better conviction. We have here therefore a fault of *conduct*, and not an error of *doctrine*. A man may know and teach the truth, and yet go astray occasionally in practice. Peter had the right view of the relation of the Gospel to the Gentiles ever since the conversion of Cornelius, he openly defended it at the apostolic council, Acts 15, 7, ff. comp. Gal. 2, 1–9, and never renounced it in theory ; but he suffered himself to be influenced by some scrupulous and contracted Jewish Christians and to act inconsistent with his better conviction. By trying to please one party, he offended the other and endangered for a moment the sound doctrine. We have here the same impulsiveness and inconstancy of temper, the same mixture of boldness and timidity in his character which made him the first to confess, and the first to deny Christ. He first refused that Christ should wash his feet and then by a sudden change wished not his feet only, but his hands and head to be washed; he cut off the ear of Malchus and a few minutes afterwards forsook his master and fled ; he solemnly promised to be faithful to him if all should forsake him, and in the same night denied him thrice.

It should be remembered, however, on the other hand, first, that the question concerning the significance of the Mosaic law, and especially of the propriety of eating meat offered to idols was a very difficult one and continued to be agitated in the apostolic Church, comp 1 Cor. 8–10. Rom. 14. The decree of the council at Jerusalem (Acts 15, 28. 29) after all stated simply the duties of the Gentile converts, strictly prohibiting them the use of meat offered to idols, but it said nothing on the duties of the Jewish Christians to the former, thus leaving some room for a milder and a stricter view on the subject. Secondly the temptation on the occasion here referred to must have been very great, since even Barnabas the Gentile apostle, was overcome by it. Finally, however, much as we may deplore and censure the weakness of Peter and admire the boldness and consistency of Paul, the humility and meekness with which the oldest and most eminent of the twelve apostles seems to have borne the public rebuke of a younger colleague, are deserving of high praise. How touching is his subsequent allusion in 2 Pet. 3, 15. 16 to the very epistles of his "beloved brother Paul," in one of which his own conduct is so sharply condemned. This required a rare degree of divine grace which did its full work in him through much suffering and humiliation, as the spirit of his epistles abundantly proves.

11. But when Cephas came to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was condemned.

V. 11. The scene here related took place in all probability between the Apostolic conference, alluded to in the preceding part of the chapter, and the second great missionary journey of Paul in 51. To the same period must be assigned the dispute between Paul and Barnabas on account of Mark, related Acts 15, 30–40. It seems that soon after that conference a reaction took place in favor of the strict Jewish Christian party who were either dissatisfied with the result Acts 15, 22 ff. or more probably gave them a rather narrow interpretation.

"*Cephas*" must be the apostle mentioned v. 9, and not one of the seventy disciples, as Clement of Alexandria and other fathers supposed, in order to clear Peter of all blame.

"*to the face,*" personally, not secretly or behind the back. Jerome and other fathers (even Chrysostom) explain it *in appearance merely* (*secundum speciem*), and suppose that the dispute had been previously arranged for the purpose of convincing, not Peter, who was right all along, but the Jewish Christian members of the congregation, that the ceremonial law was now abolished. This interpretation is not only unnatural, but makes bad worse, by charging the hypocrisy upon both Paul and Peter. St. Augustin protested against it, and Jerome himself abandoned it afterwards for the right view.

"*condemned,*" self-condemned, self-convicted by his own conduct, not by the Gentile Christians of Antioch, for Paul would hardly have waited for

12. For before the coming of certain [persons] from James, he did eat together with the Gentiles; but when

---

the judgment of others in a matter of such importance.—(The translation "he was blamed," is not strong enough, and the translation "he was to be blamed," or "deserving of censure," is ungrammatical and lame.)

V. 12. "*certain* [*persons*] *from James*," not simply members of his congregation at Jerusalem, but pupils, followers, and as the word "from" would seem to indicate, delegates of James, mentioned in v. 9. We are not to understand by them "false brethren" (v. 4), or heretical Jewish Christians who taught the necessity of the circumcision for all, and made use of the name of James without any authority on his part; for Peter would hardly have permitted such men to influence his conduct. Yet they were strict and extremely conservative Jewish Christians who regarded themselves bound to the observance of the whole law of Moses, without requiring the same from the Gentile converts.—This was the position which James took at the Council, Acts 15, 16–21, and to which he always adhered as we may infer from his advise given to Paul, Acts 21, 20–25, and also from the accounts of traditon, (especially Hegesippus, who represents him as a perfect Jewish saint). It would seem from this passage that, soon after the Council, he sent some esteemed brethren of his congregation to Antioch, not for the purpose of imposing the yoke of ceremonialism upon the Gentile Christians—for this would have been inconsistent with his speech—but for the purpose of reminding the Jewish Christians of their duty and recommending them to continue the observance of the divinely appointed and time-honored customs of their fathers which were by no means overthrown by the compromise measure adopted at the Council. It is unnecessary therefore to charge him with inconsistency. All we can say is that he stopped half way and never ventured so far as Paul, or even as Peter, who broke through the ceremonial restrictions of their native religion. Confining his labors to Jerusalem and the Jews, James regarded it as his mission to adhere as closely as possible to the old dispensation, in the hope of bringing over the nation as a whole to the Christian faith; while the Apostle of the Gentiles, on the contrary, owed it to his peculiar mission to maintain and defend the liberty of the Gospel and the rights of the uncircumcised brethren.

"*he did eat together*," which was strictly prohibited to the Jews, because the Gentiles made little or no distinction

they came, he withdrew and separated himself fearing those of the circumcision. 13. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him, so that even Barnabas was carried away by their hypocrisy. 14. But when I saw that they walked not straight according to the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephas before [them] all: "If thou, being

---

between clean and unclean animals, and because they consumed without scruple the meat offered to their idols. I suppose that the apostle refers here not only to the ordinary meals, but also to the primitive love feasts (agape) and the holy communion. A common participation of the Lord's Supper was the completion and seal of Christian fellowship and church union. We may say that it followed as a last consequence from the decree of the apostolic council, Acts 15, but it was not expressly enjoined, and the strict Jewish party thought it unsafe, for the present at least, to venture so far, contenting itself with a general recognition of the Gentile brethren, and keeping them at a certain distance.

"*he withdrew.*" Characteristic for Peter, who was the first to confess Christ, and the first to deny him; the first to recognize and defend the rights of the Gentiles, and the first to disown them practically. His strength and weakness, his boldness and timidity are the two opposite manifestations of the same warm, impulsive and impressible temper.

V. 13. "*the other Jews,* i. e., Jewish Christians of Antioch, who very naturally suffered themselves to be carried away by the example and the high authority of Peter.

"*dissembled likewise with him,*" were guilty of the same hypocrisy. A very strong, yet truthful expression. For we have here no mere accommodation to the weak for charity and peace sake, such as Paul himself taught and practised (1 Cor. 9, 20. Rom. 14, 1. 15, 3. Acts 16, 3), but a duplicity and self-contradiction at the expense of truth, a denial of the better conviction to the detriment of the Gentile Christians whom Peter acknowledged as brethren in theory, and whom he disowned in practice. The tendency of this conduct was evidently to break up the communion of the two branches of the church, although he himself would no doubt have deplored such a result.

"*even Barnabas,*" my colaborer in the work of heathen missions and fellow champion of the liberty of the Gentile brethren. This shows the power of old Jewish habits and feelings even upon more liberal minds.

V. 14. *straight,* uprightly, honestly.

"*according to.*" Others, "towards," i. e., so as to uphold and maintain the truth of the Gospel (comp. v. 5).

"*before all,*" i. e., the assem-

a Jew, livest as a Gentile, and not as a Jew, how art thou compelling the Gentiles to live as the Jews? 15. We [are] by nature Jews, and not sinners from among the Gentiles; 16. yet knowing that a man is not justified by works of the law, except by faith in Jesus Christ, we also have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by works of the law; for by works of the law shall no flesh be justified. 17. But if,

---

bled congregation. For only in this public way the censure could have its desired effect upon the body of the Jewish Christians.

The following verses to the end of the chapter are a summary report or dramatic sketch of Paul's address to Peter. It was admirably adapted to the case of the Galatians, who had fallen into the same error, and naturally expands into a direct attack on the Galatians in the third chapter.

"*livest as a Gentile,*" according to the manner and custom of the Gentiles in regard to eating, v. 12. The present tense *livest*, or *art wont to live*, implies habit (for Peter had partaken of unclean food long before, and by divine command, Acts 10), and brings out more vividly the inconsistency of Peter, who in the same breath gave up his native Judaism and led the Gentile converts back to Judaism.

"*compelling,*" not physically and directly, but morally and indirectly by the force of example. It is not necessary to suppose that the delegates of James required from the Gentile converts the observance of the Jewish ceremonies. James himself, at all events, confined it to Jewish Christians. But the example of such an apostle as Peter, implied a sort of moral compulsion even for Gentiles.

V. 15. Many commentators close here the speech of Paul to Peter; others with v. 16; still others with v. 18. But the words, "*we are only by nature Jews,*" would not suit the readers, most of whom were Gentiles by birth, and there is no mark of a return of the speech to the Galatians till 3, 1.

"*sinners,*" i. e., gross sinners without law and without God, as the heathen, according to the Jewish stand-point (comp. Matth. 9, 12 f. Luke 7, 41 f. Rom. 2, 12. Eph. 2, 12).

V. 16. On the doctrine of justification by faith see the remarks to Rom. 1, 17 and 3, 20. We are to understand here the whole law moral as well as ceremonial.

"*shall no flesh be justified,*" lit. "shall all flesh not be justified," or "find no justification." For the negation attaches to the verb, and not to the noun. But the genius of the English language requires such a transposition. The passage alludes to Ps. 143, 2: "Enter not into judgment with thy servant: for in thy sight shall no man living be justfied."

V. 17 and 18 furnish an example of the condensed and

while we seek to be justified in Christ, we ourselves also were found sinners, is therefore [I ask] Christ the minister of sin? Far from it! 18. For if I build up again the very things which I pulled down, I prove myself a transgressor. 19. For I through the law died to the law, that I might live to God. 20. I have been crucified with Christ. But

---

nervous dialectics of Paul, somewhat similar to Rom. 3, 3–8. He refutes Peter and his associates in this inconsistent conduct by deriving from it, in the form of a question, a logical inference which they themselves must indignantly reject. The sense is this: If faith be insufficient to justify, as your conduct would imply, if by giving up the Jewish law we sink to the level of the profane Gentiles (this is the sense of "sinners," comp. v. 15): it would necessarily follow that Christ instead of abolishing sin, promotes it. But such preposterous and blasphemous assertion is not to be thought of. On the contrary I myself (he politely chooses the first person, but means Peter) stand convicted of transgression if I build up again (as thou doest now at Antioch) the very law of Moses which I pulled down (as thou didst at Caesarea by divine command) and thus condemn my own former conduct.

"*Far from it,*" *may it not be; by no means.* This phrase occurs fourteen times in St. Paul, thrice in Galatians (2, 17. 21; 3, 21), ten times in Romans (3, 4. 6, 31. 6, 2, 15. 7, 7. 13. 9, 14. 11, 1. 11, and once in 1 Cor. 6, 15. It is an expression of strong denial, often mixed with moral indignation or aversion, and is generally used by Paul interjectionally in rebutting an unjustifiable inference adduced from his teaching by an opponent. The rendering "*God forbid*" in the C. V. in all these passages, is very unfortunate, as such a familiar use of God's name then prevalent in England, is not authorized by the Scriptures, but rather a violation of the third commandment.

V. 19. Comp. Rom. 7, 6. Col. 2, 20. Paul describes now his own experience with the law as he does more fully Rom. 7. The law is a schoolmaster to Christ (Gal. 3, 24), by developing the sense of sin and the need of redemption. But the very object of a schoolmaster is to elevate the pupil above the need of his instruction and tuition. So the child nurses at the mother's breast, that he might outgrow it, and passes through the school of parental authority and discipline in order to attain to age, freedom and independence. The "law" is therefore to be taken in the same sense in both cases, and those who refer it in the first instance to the law of faith, or the Gospel, and in the second to the law of Moses, miss the drift and beauty of the passage.

V. 20. "*I have been crucified*

it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me ; but that which I now live in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son

---

with Christ," not "*am,*" as the C. V. has it. For Paul means the past act which took place in his conversion, and not the continued result. It is an explanation of the word "*died,*" v. 19 (not "*am dead,*" C. V.). Since the law is a schoolmaster to Christ who fulfilled it and removed its cause by his atoning death on the cross, the believer is crucified with Christ as to his old, sinful nature, only in order to live a new spiritual life with the risen Saviour Comp. Rom. 6, 5–10.

"*But it is no longer (more) I that live,*" i. e., in the unconverted state, under the dominion of sin and the curse of the law. The C. V : "*Nevertheless I live, yet not I,*" conveys a beautiful and true idea, but is grammatically incorrect, since the original has no *yet.*

"*but Christ liveth in me,*" Christ, the crucified and risen Redeemer, who is the resurrection and the life, is the indwelling, animating and controlling principle of my life. One of the strongest and clearest passages for the precious doctrine of an organic life-union of Christ with the believer, as distinct both from a mere moral union and sympathy, and from a pantheistic confusion and mixture. Christ truly lives and moves in the believer, but the believer lives and moves also as a self-conscious personality in Christ. Faith is the bond which so unites the soul to Christ, that it puts on Christ (3, 27), that it becomes a member of his body, yea flesh and bone of his bone (Eph. 5, 30), and derives all its spiritual nourishment from him (John 15, 1 ff.). Comp. Gal. 3, 27 : "ye have put on Christ ;" 4, 19 : "until Christ be formed in you ;" 2 Cor. 1, 3. 5 : "Jesus Christ is in you ;" Col 3, 4: "When Christ who is our life, shall appear ;" Phil. 1, 21 : "For to me to live is Christ ;" John 15, 5 : "I am the vine, ye are the branches ;" John 17, 23 : "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfect in one."

"*in the flesh,*" i. e., in this bodily, temporal form of existence. It is explanatory of the preceding sentence. The life-union with Christ does not destroy the personality of the believer. Even his natural mortal life continues in this world, but as the earthen vessel containing the heavenly treasure of the imperishable life of Christ who dwells in him and transforms even the body into a temple of the Holy Spirit.

"*in the faith*" (not "*by*" the f. C. V.) corresponds to "*in the flesh,*" and conveys the idea that faith is the living element in which Paul moved.

"*the Son of God*" the object of faith, the eternal Son of the Father who has life in himself (John 5, 26), and by his incarnation and his atoning death on the cross has become

of God who loved me and gave himself for me. 21. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness [come] by the law, then Christ died in vain.

---

the fountain of divine life to man.

V. 21. *I do not frustrate,"* make of no effect, null and void, as the Judaizers do with their assertion of the necessity of the law for justification.

"*the grace of God,"* which revealed itself in the infinite love and atoning death of Christ, v. 20.

"*in vain,"* i. e., without fruit or effect. Others explain according to the usual mean- of the Greek word: gratuitously, without cause, which gives likewise good sense. If the observance of the law of Moses or any other human work could justify and save man, the atoning death of Christ would of course be unnecessary as well as fruitless. The power of this concluding argument Peter could not resist, and he no doubt felt ashamed and humbled at this rebuke, as he did after the denial of his master, although Paul, from discretion and kindness, says nothing of the result of this collision.

(To be concluded in another number.)

Art. II.—THE MARVELLOUS IN MODERN TIMES.

Histoire du Merveilleux dans les Temps Modernes, par Louis Figuier. Tome premier (Les Diables de Loudun, Les Convulsionaires Jansenistes),—Tome deuxieme (La Baguette divinatoire, Les Prophetes protestants).

We are not of those who reject every marvel simply because it seems to have occurred in direct contravention of the laws of nature. There is really an extreme of incredulity as well as of credulity in the world,—one manifested by those who reject every thing they cannot understand, and the other by those who hail with delight all that is mysterious and obscure, reject the proper modes of testing its claims on our belief, and live a life of servile dependence on the creations of their own or their neighbor's fancies. There is a singular fact, connected with these extremes, illustrating the old proverb "that extremes meet,"—a spirit of irreligion, or rather a want of true religious faith, seems to pervade both the extremely credulous and the willfully incredulous. Thus we find these two classes rarely properly represented among humble, faithful, God-fearing Christians. These are willing to recognize the wonders of an Almighty hand in the pages of history, whether blood-stained by the records of battles or adorned with the triumphs of inventive peace,—those dispute the existence of every thing that is not plainly the result of known physical laws: or these reject all demonstrations of natural phenomena which are claimed to be produced by spiritual means as lying wonders calculated to bewilder the mind and lead the soul from the wholesome ways of truth,—while those, too proud to be humble Christians, and anxious for some new revelation, hail all the miserable tricks of charlatans as so many indications of spiritual communication and interference, and allow themselves to be blinded by their conceit until all the security, afforded by the sheet-anchors of reason and faith, being lost, they drift out into the illimitable ocean of ignorance and superstition.

The Christian does not feel himself obliged to believe every thing his senses report to his brain, if such reports involve a contradiction of the laws of nature, and are manifestly not intended to communicate any great fact or wondrous message from the Creator; and, on the other hand, he does not feel called upon to explain the cause—the trickery it may be—of the mysterious phenomenon. Where pretended revelations from the spiritual world attack the truth of Holy Scripture, the teachings of the Church, and the experience of the saints of all ages, it is a matter of small importance, whether the Devil and his wicked spirits be considered *mediately* or *immediately* concerned. It is not worth the time consumed in the discussion, to determine whether the powers of the lower world have acted upon the hearts of men so as to make them conscious deceivers of their fellow men. The main point for the Christian to keep in view, in these cases, is, that, whatever attacks directly a part of his Christian faith, must be thrust aside as dangerous and even deadly in its tendency. If he do this, he may be called illiberal, unprogressive and superstitious, but he will keep in the true path and will be justly entitled to none of these stigmas.

On the other hand, it is not unchristian to believe in "the continuance of apostolic gifts." Dr. Bushnell has well said,* on this subject, "there are yet, in every age, great numbers of godly souls, and especially in the lower ranges of life, to whom the conventionalities of opinion are nothing, and the walk with God every thing, who dare to claim an open state with Him; to pray with the same expectation, and to speak of faith in the same manner, as if they had lived in the apostolic times. And they are not the noisy, violent class, who delight in the bodily exercises that profit little, mistaking the fumes of passion for the revelations of God, but they are, for the most part, such as walk in silence, and dwell in the shades of obscurity."

Via media is always the most difficult path to discover,

*Nature and Supernatural, 490.

but it is the safest, nay the only safe path for the traveller. No labor, or care, is too great which may lead to its discovery. We must steer clear from those who solely believe in the every day natural phenomena of life, as well as those who delight in the glitter of novelties. Both will have a host of followers. Mankind is not only prone to disbelief, but also paradoxical as it may seem, to adopt novelties.

> "Whate'er absurdity the brains
> May hatch, yet it ne'er wants wet-nurses to suckle it:
> Or dry ones, like a hen, to take the pains
> To lead the nudity abroad, and chuckle it;
> No whim so stupid but some fool will buckle it
> To jingle bell-like on his empty head;
> No mental mud—but some will knead and knuckle it,
> And fancy they are making fancy bread."

The History of the Marvellous in Modern Times is fraught with interest to the student. It shows how prone man is to run after novelties, to desert old paths, and how epidemic the belief in wonders may be at certain periods in the world's history. Whole countries have been over run with strange delusions seizing the wisest as well as the most ignorant, and fanaticism, laughing reason to scorn, has reigned triumphant over all. To collect clear and impartial accounts of some of these in modern times has been the self-consigned task of the sprightly Figuier, and two volumes have already appeared as the half of his contribution to the literature of this subject. He promises additional volumes on *Animal Magnetism*, *Table-rappings* and quasi-*Spiritual communications*. We doubt whether the world is yet prepared to discuss these, but when his volumes appear, if other engagements do not claim our pen, we hope to make them subjects of other papers for the consideration of the readers of the Review. For the present, we purpose noticing the two volumes, which have already appeared, full of much that is interesting, novel and instructive to those who will tear off the covering to read the concealed moral. The past is pregnant with that which may be made instructive to the present, if we will but labor to understand it.

Figuier, looking upon the pretended marvellous manifes-

tations of the present as the necessary and almost inevitable development of similar phenomena in past ages, is somewhat skeptical, but his facts are always reliable. He considers that "the marvellous is food so necessary to the human mind, that, among all people and in all ages, there has existed a belief in extraordinary things and an admission of the existence of supernal facts. The harmony of the phenomena of the world, the order of nature and the constant regularity with which its laws are exhibited, can not satisfy this passion for wonder." The priests of India,—the brahmins of the first rank—proceeding from the brain of Brahma, were supposed to be the proper *media* for the communications of man with the divinity. Zoroaster formed the spiritual and material world out of an universal fluid, which was the actual substance of divinity. From this, it was an easy matter, to form minor deities and to create prodigies. The Pythoness, seated on the tripod, inhaling exhalations from the earth, fell into convulsions and uttered words which were interpreted by her attendants as prophetic communications. The pages of classic history are full of wonders of this kind, showing that the Greeks and Romans were ever ready to believe in something higher and more powerful than the merely human. As we approach the Christian Era the curious legend of Epithases meets our eyes; while becalmed near the isles of the Ægean Sea, a mysterious voice calls on Thamas, the pilot, and orders him to cry out with a loud voice, when the vessel should arrive at a certain position, that *great Pan was dead.* Thamas having obeyed this order, the air was filled with groanings and lamentations. Whether this is entitled to credence, or is merely a poetic mode of expressing the opening of the period when the overthrow of paganism was to be accomplished, and the reign of true miracles was to be established,—it is foreign from our design to discuss now.

Shortly after the beginning of the Christian Era, prodigies are attributed to the wonderful supernatural power of magicians and soothsayers, which far exceed those said to

have been produced in the more distinctly pagan days of Roman history. Simon of Samaria was thought, by the enemies of the Christians, to be the special envoy of the ancient divinities with full authority to demonstrate their powers and might,—by the Christians he was considered as being favored by demoniacal aid. All his acts, seen through the dim corridors of the past, assume a miraculous character. He is said to have created statues that moved boldly before wondering crowds, and to have remained sound and uninjured amid the flames of a funeral pile. Contemporaneous with this juggler, was Apollonius of Thyanes, who lived to the age of one hundred and thirty years. He possessed the power of transporting himself at will from one place to another, of converting himself into various objects like the fabled Proteus, and of evoking "spirits from the vasty deep." At Ephesus, when the plague was depopulating the city, he attributed the cause to an evil spirit they were harboring within the walls. An old beggar was seized upon as this evil spirit. Being stoned to death, instead of the body of a man a carcass of a dog was found, which being interred the plague ceased. In these days sorcerers and magicians became so numerous that "the poets complain of them as a scourge, and edicts of expulsion were issued on several occasions by the emperors." Tacitus relates that the opportunity was also employed to rid the city, at the same time, of the philosophers.

They were followed by men who worked in accordance with their formulae, but without a tithe of their talents or skill. The very edicts of banishment gained them partisans. Mankind is always disposed to array itself on the side of the apparently persecuted. Christian rites and ceremonies, not understood, were mingled with pagan ceremonies, and a mongrel magical art was the result which increased with the lapse of time, till saints, angels and archangels were invoked to aid in the most questionable investigations and pursuits. The psalms were employed as an important part of the ritual of the magicians. The

disease gained its height in the middle ages, and we turn over the pages, written by its followers, with an astonishment that knows not whether to express itself in smiles or tears. A collection of forty chief treatises, on Magic and allied subjects, written in the middle ages and published under the title of *Schätze aus Kloster-Bibliotheken*, has come into our possession, and we think it incomparably the greatest farrago of nonsense we have ever met. Hebrew, Chaldaic and meaningless words are strung together, like beads on a string,—and supposed, when cited in due order, to be all powerful in bringing forth familiar spirits.*

But we cannot follow the history of magic with any closeness,—the whims, conceits, follies and supposed demoniac possessions of ages nearer the present demand our attention. Demoniacal possession being a fact in the early portion of the Christian era, when the period of division and schism had arrived, this charge proved a powerful weapon in the fratricidal wars that were constantly taking place. The Church distinguished between those who had voluntarily signed the contract with the Evil One, and those who were affected through the vile arts of sorcery. It was supposed there were those, like Faust, who would peril their soul's salvation for the power of commanding the powers of the earth, air and sea. These were subjected to death in all the forms that an ingenious cruelty could command. The Church had a special rite for exor-

*A spirit is thus invoked, who was supposed to have charge of hidden treasure: Audi, audi spiritus obstinax, qui Thesaurum sub hac terra, unde ista portio desumpta est, latentem custodis, aut possides. Adonay, Sabbaoth, Cadas, adonay, ammara, alli, adoy, Sabbaoth, ammara, collniziara, offina, altennedera, fuffa, Menfent, Bengraf, hamasixin, ula, ula, coraf. Jasuren, omasixel, sehani, eissoas, leroas, Hasiedin, ha siedin omdin, lafonaff, Kaslah, laugna, bosuras, chaphirh, chaphirach, hami, Kopa, heogunh, Scheuschen, togas, togos, hage, Phanim, debugim, menaihuh, menaihuch, Schegamhim, &c., &c., &., &c. Veni, compare, et affer statim Thesaurum petitum modo libi, tuisque praescripto hic loci, et satisfac petitioni meae in omnibus ad amussim ocyus. Letamnim, letaglogo, letasynin, tebaganaritin, letarminim, letagelogin, letafalosin, Amen. Will the reader only think of 718 pages *done up* in that style!

Schätze aus Kloster-bibliotheken, 548.

cising a demon who had become incarnate in the body of a man. After mass, the person, having previously fasted, the demon was ordered to make a certain sign in the name of Christ. If this was made, the fact of possession was established, and the rites of exorcism were proceeded with.

In 1436, in the environs of Berne and Lausanne, a class of men arose who devoured human flesh, even eating their own children, pretending that these foul deeds were done in accordance with the command of Satan. Hundreds of individuals, suspected of these crimes were exposed to torture and acknowledged them.* In 1459 the mania of sorcery seized Artois, and those apprehended by the ecclesiastical authorities admitted attendance on nocturnal meetings, where the filthiest orgies were performed. In 1484, Innocent VIII. issued a bull against those who practiced the arts of sorcery in the regions of Cologne, Mayence, Treves and Salzburg. Among those arrested in this region many confessed the crime of anthropophagy, being impelled thereto by "*un instinct diabolique.*" One *sage-femme*, who was burned at Dann, in the diocese of Basle, confessed that she had destroyed more than forty infants. It is a question whether any of the accused were *really* guilty of anthropophagy, or had merely pretended the performance of the act, under the influence of an epidemic mania.

In the Sixteenth century, the juridical horrors were the same as in the Fifteenth. Over thirty thousand victims were made to suffer for the crime of heresy in the reign of Philip II. of Spain, and many were burned alive at Calahorra, being accused of sorcery. In Italy appeared the *Stryges*, sorceresses, who claimed that, by mentally invoking the power of a demon and by virtue of some sacramen-

* J'ai appartenu, disait l'un d' eux, ainsi que ma femme, à la corporation des sorciers ; j'ai renoncé aux grâces du baptême, à la foi chrétienne, à l'adoration du Christ. J'ai pris l'engagement de fléchir le genou devant le maître de l'enfer ; j'ai bu du suc extrait de la chair d'enfant, suc que les adorateurs de Satan conservent précieusement dans des outres ; ce breuvage procure un savoir qui n'appartient qu'aux initiés.

tal words, they could transform themselves into cats. In the shape of the latter they pretended that they could enter, through windows and other openings, rooms where infants were exposed, and then extract their blood through punctures made for the purpose. In 1521, Zoanthropia assumed another form in the mountains of the Jura. It was pretended that men assumed the form of wolves, and devoured women and little children. Three men, Pierre Burgot, Michel Verdung and Philibert Montôt, charged with being were-wolves (*loups-garous*), were burned alive, and their portraits were suspended in the church at Poligny. In 1522, the convents of Holland, Germany and Italy became objects of attraction from the singular forms which hysteria assumed in the nuns. Exorcisms were resorted to, and where these would not quiet the nervous irregularities, severer penalties were adopted. From many of the symptoms reported we can have no difficulty in guessing at the cause of the hysteria, but medical disquisitions are prohibited in the pages of the Review.

The mother of the great Kepler was charged with the practice of magic and barely escaped being burned alive. Her son deemed it his duty to protect his mother from the charge, although he did not deny the reality and power of sorcery. Indeed the seventeenth century abounded in instances of men and women, who were subjected to severe tortures, and even death, on account of complicity with the powers of the lower regions. Fire was the catholicon supposed to be alone efficient in such dire cases, and its purifying agency was invoked in the most absolute way imaginable.

Figuier gives, at full length, an account of the *demonmania* which prevailed, about the year 1632, in an Ursuline Convent, composed of the daughters of the nobility and established at Loudun, a little village in the diocese of Poitiers. At first, the nuns were said to leave their beds at nights, and to crawl over the roofs as somnambulists, thence descending to the chambers of the boarders. Complaint was made that they were beset by spectres at night,

and that blows had been received, the marks of which remained. The priest, attached to the establishment, Mignon, concluded that the symptoms justified the idea of *possession diabolique*. The advice of a neighboring priest, who was continually employed in hunting out demoniacs, being obtained, he began to exorcise the superior and two of the nuns. The condition of affairs in the convent was soon made public, and the two zealous priests deemed it proper to report to the Judge and Civil Lieutenant of the village. As soon as they reached the convent, they were informed by Barré, the Exorcist, that he had driven the demons out of the Superior and one of the Sisters, and that one was named *Astaroth*, and the other *Sabulon*. It seems, however, that the exorcism wasn't very efficient, as the Superior was seized with convulsions at this visit. The sorcerer, charged with the foul work, was Urbain Grandier, a priest. The demon was publicly interrogated in Latin, and answers were returned in the same tongue*,—but when the demon, possessing a lay sister (who did not understand Latin), was interrogated no answer could be obtained. The Civil Lieutenant wished to know whether the possessed had any difficulty with Grandier, but the priest would not allow, what he called, "indiscreet questions."

On investigation, after leaving the convent, the civil authorities found that the *same* series of questions had previously, on several occasions, been proposed to the supposed demon who inhabited the Superior's body. They demanded that all further exorcisms should be performed in conjunction with exorcists appointed by civil authorities. Mignon simply asserted that they had not objected to the presence of the civil authorities; and Barré asserted that he

---

* The following queries and answers are said to have been made by the exorcist and given by the demon, possessing the Superior. Q. Propter quam causam ingressus es in corpus hujus virginis? A. Causâ animositatis. Q. Per quod pactum? A. Per flores. Q. Quales? A. Rosas. Q. Quis misit? A. Urbanus. Q. Dic cognomen? A. Grandier. Q. Dic qualitatem? A. Sacerdos. Q. Cujus ecclesiæ? A. Sancti Petri. Q. Quae persona attulit flores? A. Diabolica.

had discovered, instead of one devil, *Astaroth*, tormenting the Superior, there were really seven, whose names he glibly recited. The history of the *pacte* was as follows: "Urbain Grandier had delivered it, in the form of a bouquet of roses, to a certain Jean Pivart—a magician of an inferior order—; this Pivart gave it to a young girl, who had thrown it over the garden wall into the convent." The authorities demanded that they should be allowed to see the possessed. But the energumens exhibited *then* neither contortion nor grimace, and chanted quietly, along with the other sisters, during the celebration of the mass. On another occasion, however, the Superior was seized with convulsions, foaming at the mouth, and the demon, when asked at what time he would leave her, answered, *cras mane.* He resisted the litanies and even the power of the holy ciborium, when placed on the head of the possessed. Shortly after the Superior regained her natural condition and, smiling, said to Barré: *Il n'y a plus de Satan en moi.* A circumstance is related here that was very common in demonopathia, the Superior, freed from this crisis, neither recollected the questions or answers. She pretended that at ten o'clock at night her hand had been seized and pricked, and that immediately afterwards she discovered three spines in it.

A cat being found in the chamber, it was declared to be the demon, but the cat proved to be an old attaché of the convent. A large bouquet of white roses was gathered in the garden, and was thrown into the fire by Barré with the hope of eliciting some preternatural phenomena, but they only burned in the natural way. Barré, however, pledged his faith as an exorcist that he would compel the devil to leave or to make manifest, in a most indubitable manner, the possession of the Ursulines.

Let us see, for the clear understanding of this curious event in history, who was Urbain Grandier. He had been a student with the Jesuits at Bordeaux, afterwards *curé* of the church of St. Peter at Loudun, and a prebend in the chapter of Sainte-Croix at the same place. This possess-

ion of two benefices irritated his brethren,—and, moreover, he was a good preacher, an easy and elegant writer, and a gallant, attractive gentleman. Charges had been brought against him involving his moral character in the most absolute way. A large number of persons figured as his accusers, although they did not appear against him on trial. He was condemned to fast on bread and water for three months, interdicted *a divinis* for five years in the diocese of Poitier, and forever in the city of Loudun. Having appealed to the parliament of Paris, the whole affair was entrusted to the *Presidial* of Poitiers. Here the sentence was reversed, and the archbishop of Bordeaux absolved him from the ecclesiastical penalty. Grandier used his triumph so as to annoy his enemies as much as possible, re-entered the city shaking a laurel branch as a token of his victory.

His fame having penetrated the convent, associated with reports of his eloquence, and beauty, contests with and victory over his enemies, without doubt was the cause of his name being suggested to the poor nuns, in the height of their hysterical attacks, as the cause of the same.

But to proceed with our epitome of this history,—Grandier demanded that the nuns be examined separately and by approved exorcists, who were at least not his open enemies. However, the exorcisms were carried on in church by the same Barré. The possessed always answered in Latin, indicative of bad grammatical training, and full of solecisms. In every case, the name of Grandier was mentioned as the magician. A series of contradictions having been from time to time detected in the communications of the quasi-possessed, the archbishop of Bordeaux sent his own physician to examine into the matter, but nothing being discovered by him, the prelate forbade the pretended exorcists from hereafter practising the art, and assigned its practice to two priests. No more indications being found, in the convent, of demonopathia, Grandier was again triumphant.

Such triumph could not last long, especially in an age when the really mysterious was being overlooked in the

Church, and mankind was on the alert for something that should claim its wonder. Despite the contradictory and improbable character of the testimony, he was at length condemned to death. The only proof was that arising from a persistance, on the part of the accused, in their accusation. Grandier was finally burned at the stake. His last words were: "Deus, Deus, ad te vigilo, miserere mei, Deus! While the priest Lactance was lighting the fire, Grandier said—there is a God in heaven, who will be both thy judge and mine,—I summons thee to appear before him in one month. It is a singular fact, that Lactance died exactly one month from the death of Grandier, in frightful convulsions, as though he had been possessed of all the demons that he had been pursuing.

The death of Grandier did not diminish the troubles in the nunnery. We sicken as we read the details of incidents, connected with demonopathia among these females, who had separated themselves from the world with the view of serving God, but who, on the contrary, were contributing to the support of the worst passions and feelings of their fellow men, by enabling them to denounce any troublesome person as a magician. "The mortal blow to the whole, was the withdrawal of the pension of four thousand livres per month, which the king had allowed for the support of the exorcists and the nuns. Richelieu began to believe that if it were continued longer, the farce would only serve to exhibit the injustice of the condemnation of Grandier; * * his own death (Dec. 18, 1638) was the signal of the definitive flight of all the inferior demons that still swarmed about Loudun." The nuns, nevertheless, were the recipients of distinguished honors. "Jeanne de Belfiel—the mother superior—one of the principal actresses in the troop, was the object of the greatest favors. Presented at Court, she was complimented by the King and Queen, and honored by the benediction of the cardinal-minister, * * she lived for years, surrounded with an aureola of sanctity, and wanted nothing to prevent her canonization after death."

Can modern science aid us in comprehending this curious episode in the history of the seventeenth century? Esquirol considers all the phenomena, exhibited by the nuns, as symptoms of what he styles *demonomania;* Bertrand claims that they were only phenomena of extacy. Figuier puts the whole matter very forcibly before his readers, as follows; "The convulsions proceeded from hysteria, The disease was perfectly marked in three of them. We believe that it existed *a priori* in the convent, and that it caused the first convulsive and contagious symptoms, through imitation. But this affection, the nervous system being constantly irritated, gives rise to such a physiological condition, that every physical or moral excitement would bring this system into play, provoking disorders and extraordinary cries from the sick person. Indeed young hysterical girls are now considered marvellous *subjects* for magnetizers. The hysterical nuns thus became pliant tools, in their fits of somnambulism, in the hands of the zealous exorcists." They were to a certain extent moved at the suggestion of the latter, to adopt any ideas which might be presented. The name of Grandier had been associated with every thing calculated to bewilder and charm the young, for he had beauty, talent, wit and reputation. It was an easy matter to make one, who had allowed her mind to dwell upon him, to believe that he was the cause of the convulsions to which she was subject. Imitation would soon place others in the same position. The general belief in magic easily induced them to charge this, upon the gay and handsome young priest. These were the days, our readers will recollect, when ugly, old women were put out of the way, by first being charged with witchcraft and sorcery, and dashing youths were disposed of under the plea that they were magicians. The old proverb reminds us that "to give a dog a bad name is the sure method of destroying him," and we know that even a dog may be scared to death when a tin-pan is tied to his tail. We can destroy a man, either by exciting the public against him, or by so wounding his own sensibility that he shall shun the public eye.

With the above mentioned causes inducing the belief that they were under some influence of Grandier, it is easy to perceive how the nuns would feign demoniacal possession. The latter gave them notoriety,—brought them prominently before the community. This notoriety was too dear not be preserved at any price. Thus, the first wrong step having been taken, the path was comparatively an easy one through deceit, and lies innumerable. The devils of Loudun would be exorcized now, *not* by ecclesiastical butby medical treatment, and their history would be a very short one.

The fall of the Jansenists in 1720 had been accomplished, after protracted and vigorous efforts on the part of the Jesuits. The propositions of Quesnel had been the cause of much dissension, and ecclesiastic quarrels had become a disgrace to the Church. At this time of defeat and overthrow of the Jansenists, they began to exhibit miraculous phenomena as a "protest against their overthrow and with the view of showing the world, that Providence did not approve of the judgments pronounced on their cause by men." Shortly before this period, James II, of England, found his greatest consolation in exile, at Saint Germain, in *touching* those afflicted with scrofula. The king's touch was supposed to be endowed with miraculous healing properties. After his death, the Jesuit fathers claimed for his tomb still more wonderful properties. "The sainted monarch, says Salgues, did not confine himself to curing the King's evil; he made the lame to walk, gave suppleness to the limbs of the gouty, corrected defective vision and untied the tongues of stammerers and mutes."

It was necessary that the Jansenists should show some signs as wonderful as those exhibited at the monarch's grave. Vialart, archbishop of Châlons sur Marne, had exhibited great piety conjoined with gentle tolerance during his life, had opposed the persecution of protestants, and the stigma thrown on the character of Jansenius by the charge of heresy. At his grave, rheumatisms, diseases of the skin and ulcers were relieved almost instantly. Investigations being had, the following results were announc-

ed by the examining physicians in the case of thirty four miracles reported,—twenty two were explainable from causes purely physical, eleven were probably supernatural, and one necessarily so.

But the reputation of these was overshadowed by that of the Abbe Francis of Paris, more familiarly known as Deacon Paris. He had lived a life of extreme religious mortification, which was terminated by death, May 1, 1727. His remains were interred in the cemetery of Saint Medard, and the grave became the scene of some of the most astonishing performances ever executed by religious fanaticism. The first cure was alleged to have been performed in the case of an old-clothes-man, Pierre Lero, who had been suffering from indolent ulcers on his left leg, which had resisted all the treatment of his barber-surgeon Tanson. He was carried to the grave, gave twelve sous to a good woman to perform a *neuvaine* (nine days devotion) for him, twelve to a sacristan to have a mass said. In addition he obtained a piece of the bed of the deacon which he applied to the leg and *kept himself quiet.* On the tenth day, he was cured and the cure was considered a miracle performed by deacon Paris. This case was followed up by the cure of Marie Jeanne Orget, who for thirty years had been treated by physicians and surgeons for erysipelas. Being carried to the cemetery, she prayed the saint that she might not only be cured, but be supplied with strength to work for her support (she was then 57 years old). The relief was immediate, and she was able to leave the cemetery without assistance. It is true, that the recovery of this woman was seriously doubted by the Jesuit fathers, and that she had said nothing about the cause of it until obliged by her Jansenist confessor, still at her last moments she repeated her belief in the presence of the notaries.

These quasi miracles were nothing to what followed, when a tomb was erected over the remains of the deacon, around which were to be exhibited those wonderful convulsions and transports of prophetic delirium, which attracted the attention of all France and made the account of

the "*Convulsionnaires Jansenistes*," occupy a curious place in the history of the last century. After the erection of the tomb, the miracles, asserted to be effected by the efficacy of the saint, increased. A girl afflicted with paralysis was cured, and other cases followed so rapidly, that Montgeron, published in three large quarto volumes, an account of the miracles operated through the intercession of the deacon. "The cemetery of Saint Medard, although all the soil and stones contained therein partook of the efficacy of the ashes of the deacon, became a theatre too small for the expansive nature of the work to be performed. It extended to other churches and cemeteries." The Jesuits availed themselves of the power of the government, and soon the Jansenists obtained the benefits which accrue from a vindictive persecution.

Now began the famous convulsive movements, which always accompanied the cures of those who resorted to the mortuary shrine of the Abbe Francis of Paris. Our limits warn us that we can only furnish an account of one case, but *ex uno disce omnes*. We cite the case of Marie-Anne Vassereau, who was laboring under a frightful aggregation of infirmities: swelling of the legs, resulting from badly treated small pox, paralysis, lachrymal fistula, caries of the nasal bones &c., &c. "At first, the spirit of the saint made no remarkable demonstration. But as she heard mass, Dec. 1, 1731, her body was seized with tremblings; she entered the cemetery and the tremblings increased; she approached the tomb and they became convulsions. On the next day the spirit of the saint acted still more strongly. Her head became confused,—her legs, arms and thighs were extraordinarily agitated. She lost consciousness, but, being carried in the charnel-house (*charniers*) and restoratives being applied, she recovered. She returned home, but the convulsions attained such a character then, that the domestics and neighbors were required to hold her limbs. The convulsive movements accompanied her when she walked out, so that passersby were obliged to prevent her from breaking her head or throwing herself in the river. The

days following exhibited similar scenes. She attained curious notoriety in the Faubourg of Saint-Jacques, and nothing was spoken of, save the convulsions of Marie-Anne Vassereau. Her nurses were deprived of all rest; she fell in the pews, in the kitchen and wherever she went." Finally the relief came———. The denoument arrives, somewhat after the *ridiculus-mus*-order of the poet.

"These convulsions were the signal that lighted up a new dance of Saint-Guy, resuscitated in Paris in the eighteenth century, with infinite variations, some more lugubrious or buffoon-like than others. From all quarters of the city they ran to the cemetery of Saint-Medard, to participate in the shiverings, or *crispations*, and tremblings. Sick or not, each pretended to fall into convulsions, and had his own style of convulsions. It was a true tarentula-dance. * * The soil of the cemetery and the adjoining streets was an arena of contention for a multitude of girls, women and invalids of all ages, who zealously contended in convulsions. Men on the ground struggled in real epilepsy, and some swallowed pebbles, bits of glass and even live coals." The most indecent and filthy exhibitions were made by both sexes, and, in the name of religion, things were perpetrated which would not have been tolerated in the Saturnalia of pagan Rome. Certain of the *convulsionnaires* assumed positions representing some religious mysteries, selecting especially scenes from the Passion. "In the midst of all this, nothing was heard but groaning, singing, howling, hissing, declaiming, prophecying, and caterwauling. But what predominated in this convulsionary epidemic was the dance. The chorus was conducted by Abbe Bècherand, an ecclesiastic, who stood, so that every one could see him, on the tomb of the saint. There he daily executed, with a skill above all rivalry, his favorite *pas*, the famous saut de carpe (somer sault), which the spectators never tired of admiring. The Abbe himself belonged to the number of those who had undergone the curative convulsions. One of his legs was fourteen inches shorter than the other,—a defect however which did not interfere

with his favorite dance. He declared that the leg was lengthened, every three months, one line."

"On the twenty seventh of January 1732 the cemetery was closed and the entrance walled up by order of the king." A distinguished, Jansenist lawyer, named Carré de Montgeron, going to the king to present the book he had written to demonstrate the truth of the miracles, was brutally arrested and thrown into prison, where he died after seventeen years imprisonment. The *convulsionnaires* were now treated with the greatest rigor, and, of course, thrived under it amazingly. Although tracked from street to street, driven from *quartier* to *quartier*, they increased in numbers. The chevalier Folard, distinguished for his contributions to military writings, was soon affiliated with them. His religion was nothing. Curious to observe the operations at Saint-Medard, he went to the cemetery. There, wounds received in war were cured, and seven days afterwards he was attacked with convulsions. He renounced all his honors and expectations, and made the rest of his life a series of convulsions, associating only with those who frequented the houses of *convulsionnaires*, or spending his time in prayer and reading books of devotion.

The cemetery being closed, a new phase was assumed by this religious mania. Patients submitted their bodies to blows from hammers and bars of iron, to cuts with knives, upon the breast, abdomen, hips, and thighs; and the victims, instead of complaining, expressed their joy. The convulsionnaires believed themselves specially set apart for the general work of edification, and with the view of accomplishing this, in the best possible manner, adopted the brutal maltreatment of their bodies, and those of their followers. They called the inhuman violences, to which they were subjected, *secours*. These were known either as *petits secours*, consisting in blows with the fist and small sticks of wood, stampings and other similar operations,—aud *les grand secours* or *secours meurtriers* which were of a more terrible character. They pretended that all this was re-

quired to aid in the restoration of a corrupt and gangrened church.*

In 1741 the excitement seemed to have ceased in Paris, but in fact the convulsionnaires still existed, and eighteen years later, it was found the epidemic was raging in all its force. We are indebted to a report of La Condamine for an account of one of their exhibitions April 13, 1759, to which he had gained admission by a subterfuge. A number of males and females had collected together in a chamber at Marais. Sister Francoise, the deanness of the convulsionnaires, was first beaten, on all parts of the body, with a bundle of chains weighing 8 to 10 pounds, by two men. This was followed by blows with sticks of wood, and being placed on her back on the ground the director walked over her several times. This woman was then *nailed* to a cross, and allowed to remain there for thee hours and a half. At the same time, a young proselyte, Sister Marie, was nailed to another cross and allowed to remain attached to it for half an hour. La Condamine remarks that "only girls and women have submitted to this cruel operation. Those who recognize in all this a good work, assert as a proof of the miracle that the victims do not suffer, and that on the contrary their torments are agreeable. This would be, indeed, a great prodigy. But I saw them give indications of the keenest anguish, and the only astonishing feature to which I can testify is the constancy and courage that fanaticism was able to inspire." The performances of the Hindoo devotees are not more sickening in their details than these;—the deluded worshipper at the shrine of Juggernaut does not resort to more horrible tortures than the convulsionnaires willingly exposed themselves to, in the name of Him who claims worship from the heart, and who

* Elle est couchè dans l'ordure et dans la poussière, s'écriait une convulsionnaire, les vers lui rongent la chair, la pourriture s'est mise jusque dans ses os, une odeur insupportable s'exhale sans cesse de la corruption qui l'enveloppe. Venez donc à sons secours, appliquez-y le fer et le feu, n'épargnez rien pour la guérir, coupez, tranchez, brûlez: il lui faut les remèdes les plus violents."

Dom. Lataste, *Lettres Theologiques.* Quoted by Figuier.

exhibits to his disciples the example of the publican, with his penitent cry for pardon, as that of one who "went down to his house justified" rather than the Pharisee who thanked God that he was not as other men.

With the close of 1760 Paris was freed from this terrible form of religious mania, although the end was not then of the miraculous cures attributed to the deacon Paris. With our knowledge of the years required to uproot a superstition from the hearts of the people, we may not be surprized to learn, that instances of miracles worked in the name of the deceased deacon are recorded as late as 1787,—and it may be that our own enlightened age has witnessed similar instances of delusion. Error is hydra-headed,—the removal of one head seems to give that stimulus which, in time, will cause another to shoot forth in fullest vigor.

Figuier attempts an explanation of the singular phenomena we have briefly laid before our readers. Two things are required in order to make such an attempt successful; careful examination, 1st of the facts, 2nd their character whether natural or miraculous. And here again, let us not be too easy with our definition of what is miraculous. In one view, all nature is a miracle past the finding-out of man,—the human body, something calculated to excite our awe as well as admiration. How wondrous the law which keeps its manifold organs in harmonious relations to each other! Why do the disturbing actions of natural causes not injure or destroy this harmony and thus bring about, that which we call, disease? And when disease is raging, who can explain how all the mysterious harmonies of health are brought to play in happy accord again? All this is a mystery,—yes, a mystery past finding out. We are still playing on the sea shore,—collecting the beautiful pebbles which the waves have cast up from the deep, but the boundless expanse of the unknown extends off into the distance. Let us learn humility and reverently bow before the Omnipotence of our Creator and Preserver. "Miracles," as has been stated by a writer in this Review (Vol. II. 578), "must themselves be authenticated as genuine heaven-

ly miracles, by carrying in them proper spiritual contents, and by being surrounded with proper spiritual connections and relations. They are of force, not abstractly and on the outside of the revelation or mission they are employed to prove, but concretely and in living union with this, as part and parcel of the whole." Judged by such a norm as this, all these miracles are dissipated as the morning clouds before the light of the sun. But we can afford to examine these epidemic convulsions more closely, so as to get at their physiological cause.

In examining the facts connected with the convulsionary epidemic, we must admit that cures were had of some of the numerous sick who crowded around the deacon's tomb. But these were very few indeed,—only fifteen or sixteen among the large number of devotees, whose exercises are narrated by Carré de Montgeron. These, however, are of such a character, that we do not require resort to the supposition of a miracle to explain them. The only argument in favor of any connection between the cures and the visits to Saint-Mèdard, is that those occurred after the visit had been made and a *neuvaine* performed. The validity of the *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* argument has been exploded long since. Still *this* argument cannot be adduced, "since the cures took place very arbitrarily, sometimes before, sometimes during and often even very long after the worship paid to the saint." No desperate cases were in fact ever brought to the notice of the saint, and some of the so-called cures proved to be deceptive as the relapses indicated. These induce us to believe that the diseases were often feigned. And some of the convulsions were voluntary imitations of those witnessed in the cemetery, as was acknowledged afterwards.

Among the convulsionnaires there were some epileptics, —and involuntary imitation caused the semblance of this disease in some which may finally have really become the disease itself. Watson, in his Practice of Medicine, quotes the following from Baglivi. Vidimus, anno 1670, in Dalmatiâ juvenem gravissimis correptum convulsionibus, prop-

terea quod inspexerat solummodo alium juvenem dum epilepsiâ humi contorquebatur : and states that " there is no *spectacle* of horror so efficacious in producing a fit of epilepsy in others, as that of a person suffering under epilepsy." The symptoms, generally presented by these fanatics, were simply due to a species of nervous affection, which was either St. Vitus' dance, epilepsy or hysteria,—and the latter was probably the principal cause. The curative means recognized as proper for the latter were generally efficient. Occasionally the adoption of purely moral treatment proved sufficient. At one time there was a suicidal epidemic in Milet, among the girls, and the town feared depopulation. It was checked by a decree, that every body of a girl who hung herself should be exposed naked in public, and then be dragged by a cord around the neck on a hurdle. The decree cured the disease.

Boerhaave's cases at the Harlem hospital are known to medical men. All the female patients in one of the wards fell into convulsions in imitation of one naturally so affected. He brought into the ward, a chafing dish full of live coals, and proceeded to heat a steel instrument red hot, announcing that he would burn the first patient who would have a convulsion. The result was—the disappearance of the disease.

A word or two as to the cause of toleration of painful blows and cuts, which were altogether disproportionate to the feeble strength of those receiving them. " The power of resistance and the condition of insensibility seem to arise from the extreme changes in sensibility, which the exaltation of any passion will produce in the animal economy. Rage, fear, in a word, any passion, having reached its climax, can produce such insensibility. * * Moral excitement often extinguishes all sensibility. Soldiers with fatal wounds, have continued to fight, without suspecting their presence, until they have fallen dead. * * In Italy a fanatic having crucified himself his physician reports, that he suffered nothing from his wounds duri the religious delirium, although he experienced horrible sufferings when

reason had returned." From all the foregoing it will be readily concluded, with our author, that there was nothing in the convulsions and extacies of the Saint-Médard cemetery, which is inexplicable by the laws of medicine, physiology or psychology.

Towards the end of the seventeenth century, the spirit of persecution, evinced by the Romanists, excited a species of religious fervor among the Protestants, which manifested itself in erratic acts that entitle the "Protestant Prophets" to a notice in our retrospective of the marvellous in Modern Times. Louis XIV, in the midst of his debauches, was sometimes visited by compunctions of conscience and dreams of future punishment. His spiritual advisers suggested that he could ensure his own salvation by securing proselytes from the heretical reformers to the ranks of the Roman Church,—and that the best way of accomplishing this was by means of money,—purchasing the poor. Under the direction of Cardinal Le Camus, this important business of bribery for religious purposes was carried on by Pellisson, an apostate Calvinist. Among the poor classes of Huguenots this plan, it is asserted, had some success. The medium price allowed did not exceed a crown of six livres. The additions to the list of converts were shown to the king, every quarter, and the courtier, Pellisson, endeavored to make the monarch believe that the whole world would yield either to his might or his benevolence. The king became more anxious to increase the church, and adopted every cruel plan suggested by the bigoted Romanists; in 1680 twenty Protestant churches were destroyed in Vivarais. Children were allowed to abjure their religion at seven years of age; and many were taken away from their parents in the provinces, simply because they had learned the *Ave Maria* from the servants, which was an evidence of their desire to abjure Protestantism. This act, so similar to that of the Mortara boy in Italy, which created so much excitement a few years since, was in violation of all the protection guarranteed by the Edict of Nantes. It was only the signal for persecutions in a thousand forms,

each more ingenious than its predecessor. A regular system of compulsory retraction was established under the agency of Louvois, the minister. Bribes were changed for force. A dragoonade of the country, beginning at Bearn—the birth-place of Henry of Navarre, was adopted and soldiers were employed as the missionaries of a religion professing to breathe peace and goodwill. Voltaire* thus speaks of the manner this dragoonade was begun: "An archbishop, an intendant, a pastor, or some one with authority marched at the head of the soldiers. The principal Calvinistic families, especially those considered most pliable, were assembled. These renounced their religion in the name of the others: the obstinate were delivered over to the soldiers, who were allowed to do any thing with them but take their lives. Notwithstanding this, some were so cruelly treated that they died."

Louis XIV, thinking to free his kingdom at once from heretics revoked the Edict of Nantes, October 22, 1685. The Chancellor Le Tellier signed the fatal measure, crying out with hideous joy, "nunc dimittis servum tuum &c." Bossuet expended his eloquence in a funeral oration on Le Tellier, prostituting it thus in a most disreputable manner. The Revocation caused a general migration. Fifteen hundred ministers left the country! "Holding the Bible in one hand and their walking staves in the other, they set out for the different frontiers of the kingdom." These were followed by their people, when the laws and ordinances of the king had become insupportable. For a Protestant to live in France at this period was a continuous martyrdom. "He could neither marry nor make a will; his children were considered bastards." All the liberal professions and municipal offices were interdicted. He was allowed only to be a laborer, mechanic or shepherd. Religious worship was prohibited. Death was the punishment for an Evangelical minister who remained in France; death for every one engaged in Protestant worship, or caught in a worshipping assembly.

* Essai sur l'histoire générale.

This series of cruelties was established by the much bepraised Louis Quatorze,—"the most magnificent of the Bourbon kings." At length, the Calvinist peasants took arms and a religious war was the result, During this war the phenomena now to be noticed occurred. The pastors had said to their flocks, before leaving them, "Fear not: although we shall not be with you, the Spirit of the Lord will not desert you; He will not cease to be in the midst of your assemblies,—He will speak through the mouths of women and children." These words were literally received. Deprived of their churches, they assembled in the woods and mountain-fastnesses. Their preachers braved death to be with them. A religious zeal had been fostered by cruel persecution until a species of fanaticism, purely epidemic in its consequences, seized those who were thus hunted down under the ban of law. "The mountains and desert-places were peopled with phantoms for them, and resounded with revealed words." At Geneva, a school of prophecy was established, and Du Serre, a glassblower who had been ennobled, was there ordained prophet. He established a similar school, in 1689, in Dauphiny. Children were instructed in this school, by a regimen calculated to excite their imaginations in a morbid way, by long fastings, long sermons and the perusal of the Apocalypse. They soon acquired the power of entering an extatic condition, assuming singular positions. These were sent forth and constituted one party of the protestant Prophets.

But, in the neighborhood of Castres, in 1686, demonstrations were also shown of the same spirit. Indeed we may see that this epidemic broke out in many different places, at about the same time. The same persecution followed the Protestants all over France;—they were subject to want and distress every where;—the same intense religious feeling existed with them all,—and the results were alike. A little shepherdess, 10 ten years of age, asserted that an angel appeared to her and forbade her to attend mass. This was soon noised abroad. The little spark speedily became a large fire. While a famous preacher, Cor-

bière was preaching, the assembly was surrounded and dispersed. The preacher being pursued described a circle around himself, and crying out, "Get thee behind me, Satan," the troop was so horrified that they were about retreating when their captain killed him with a pistol.

Two of these prophets deserve special notice. Isabeau Vincent and Gabriel Astier. The first known as La belle Isabeau was the daughter of a wool-carder at Saou, in the diocese of Dié. Being forced to leave her home, her godfather gave her an asylum, and the occupation of guarding his sheep. While engaged here, it is supposed, that one of the prophets, ordained by Du Serre, met her and that she became impressed with her mission. Commencing in obscure houses, her fame soon spread through Dauphiny. A young lawyer, Gerlan, became attached to her and followed her to the various assemblies, where she prophesied. The notes of her prophetic speeches are given in full, in the writers of this period. On his first visit, he describes her as "a young girl of small stature, irregular countenance, thin and browned by the wind, with a large forehead, large gentle black eyes." At times she was not able to speak, and she would pray God to loose her tongue, so that she could speak to his people. Gerlan says, she spoke like an angel. At times she fell into so profound a lethargy that violent measures could not waken her to consciousness. In this condition, she would chant the psalms in a clear and intelligible voice. Afterwards she would improvise prayers, recite long passages from the Scriptures, denounce the papists, and preach with considerable force. After the extacy had passed by, she did not recollect any thing that occurred.

The reputation of La belle Isabeau was increased by the frequency of these lethargic states. Important conversions were made by her. Among the aristocracy of Dauphiny, Madame de Baix may be mentioned. She became also inspired, and communicated her inspiration to her daughter. Madame de Baix was obliged to leave the province. She retired to a house on the left bank of the Rhone.

Here more than three hundred, who heard her, were seized with the same spirit of prophecy. Isabeau being seized by the Intendant, told the judges, who threatened her with punishment: "You may kill me; but God will raise up other prophetesses who will speak better things than I."

She was confined in a hospital, where the aristocracy contended for the honor of instructing, caring for and amusing her. But the confinement of La belle Isabeau was not ended by death, but by marriage with a gentleman of the region and—her preaching ceased.

Gabriel Astier was one of the disciples of Du Serre. He communicated to his parents and sisters first the information, that the Spirit had been given him. He was obliged soon to fly from home, and after passing from place to place, he selected the Vivarais. Numerous proselytes were made on the road, who followed him to the mountains where the spirit of the Vaudois and Waldenses had left indelible traces. He was said to have been a most extraordinary orator, at a time when much pulpit oratory was known. Figuier says "it seemed as though in all these towns (Saint-Cierge, Pranles, Saint-Sauveur, Tauzuc, Saint-Michel, &c., &c.), there was no other care, no other want, but to hear the voice of the man whom they regarded as a messenger from God. The villages were too small to contain all who came to hear Gabriel, and it was necessary to hold religious assemblies in the open country, in spite of winds and snows." To these, all ages, sexes and conditions came; in many instances, they remained days from home, following the prophet from mountain to mountain, subsisting simply on apples and nuts.

William of Orange had been placed on the British throne, and the French Protestants looked for relief from him. Gabriel announced the day on which the Prince of Orange might be expected to arrive in France, with an army of a hundred thousand men, as the exterminating angel of the Roman Church The houses of worship of the Catholics would then be demolished, and a star falling on Rome would consum the pontifical chair. It is remarkable amid

all this excitement, and the whirlwind of enthusiasm by which Astier was surrrounded, that he *never* counselled violence. He and many prophets of this period, "were content with preaching obedience to God *rather than* to the king,—assuring their hearers that the faithful had nothing to fear, for God would sustain and preserve them from the sabres and balls of the enemy." And this faith and trust in God seem to have been existing in all their followers. The Protestants were hunted down in all directions. Gabriel had been in forty combats, but was finally taken at Montpellier and condemned to be broken alive on the wheel,—a punishment to which he submitted bravely, April 2, 1690.

Vivens was another of the prophets. He was distinguished for his stout and healthy body, intrepid and adventurous spirit, and true courage. Induced to believe that the day of redress for the persecuted Protestants was at hand, he returned to France from Holland in 1689. He counselled resistance; occupied himself with collecting arms, and fabricating powder and balls. He organized the first insurrection of Cevennes putting himself at the head of four hundred armed men. These were nearly all killed or taken prisoners at the first engagement. Vivens escaped, and retiring to a cavern, was kept advised of the movements of his brethren. Here he was joined by Brousson, who was actuated with the same hopes, but who did not think of their realization by violent means. Brousson had been the protestant advocate, and was then an evangelical minister, who considered it as his duty to preach and even to die for his religion, but not to push disobedience to the king to the point of revolt. He believed that he had a mission to perform, but his unchanging sweetness he and deep aversion to violent measures made him a character pleasant to contemplate even at the present day. Brousson was ordained a minister by Vivens, who had received ordination in Holland. "B. preached regularly three times a day; attended to baptisms, marriages and deaths—all ceremonies equally sad in those times; dictated forms of

prayers, pious manuals to be used by churches, who had no pastors." His life was spent in teaching rustic and almost savage hearers, the gentlest notes of gospel truth, lying at night on the ground or a bed of dry leaves. Stealthily creeping out of houses, to avoid searching parties, he was obliged often to take shelter in the wells, or on the roofs. At length he was arrested and condemned to death for complicity in Vivens' plans to introduce a foreign army into France, and the sentence was executed at Montpellier on the same day. Vivens was killed in a cavern by an apostate Jourdan, who shot him from behind. His body was afterwards burned, and in the flames his face seemed to threaten his executioners.

The enthusiasm, which had been so excessive, was somewhat restrained by the deaths of the prominent prophets, the general slaughter of the people, and the peace of Ryswick. In 1700 a maiden lady carried the prophetic spirit to the Cévennes. She communicated the spirit to a few, and these to others, until the prophets had become thousands. Women and children were peculiarly seized. Eight thousand were said to be affected this way in the Cévennes and lower Languedoc. A commission of physicians was assembled to examine a number of these children, who had been imprisoned at Uzes. The commission did nothing but call the children fanatics, and expressed their wonder at seeing illiterate children quoting Holy Scripture most appropriately. Such an examination only increased the furor. Catholic children were seized with it and made "revelations most compromising to their Church. Their extacies were not checked by menaces or punishment from their parents, * * who delivered the poor little creatures to the exorcisms of the curés. No old Catholic was persecuted on this account; but the converts received orders to prevent their children from becoming fanatics." The accounts laid down by authors of the period are most incredible, because they refer to children from fifteen months to three years of age, who were said to preach amendment of life to those around. Those who were sent to prevent them prophesying were often seized in the same way.

The inspiration then became communicated to families. Along with the gift of speech, that of second sight was said to be possessed by some. This was shown in predictions as to impending disasters, and directions as to the proper mode of avoiding them. There was one thing to be said of these prophets, which we were not able to affirm of the "possessed" of Loudun, or the "convulsionnaires" of Saint-Medard,—"those who professed to have received the graces, immediately gave up all kinds of libertinage and vanity. Some who had been debauchees became sedate and pious."

The increase of the prophets increased the meetings. These became more numerous; daily and nightly they were held, despite the prohibition of laws. Some of the prophets began to labor under the strangest delusions. Daniel Raoul pretended that he was animated with the spirit of the prophet Daniel. He was sentenced to be broken on the wheel, and marched to the scene of his death, acknowledging Christ as his Saviour, and denouncing, as idolatry, the practices of the Roman Church. Persecution could not diminish numbers, although it was pushed to the extreme. At Creux de Vaie so great was the massacre committed that, in addition to the killed, a bark and two wagons were filled with the wounded and sent to Montpellier. A prophet was among these with his four sons. He was hung, three of the sons were condemned to the gallies and the fourth died in prison.

Several women were gibbetted, because they ran about, crying "God has given us tears of blood to weep for the desolation of Jerusalem," while drops of blood trickled from their eyes and noses. Prophecies now multiplied about some great coming event, the object of which would be the reestablishment of the Protestant religion. Abraham Mazel, Solomon Couderc and Pierre Séguier, the great prophets of the mountains, began to predict that certain persons were destined to chastise the enemies of truth. These predictions and the increasing cruelty of the Catholic priests, brought on at last the general insurrection of the

Cevennes. The abbe Du Chayla figures with bloody notoriety among his co-religionists. An attack was made on his chateau, under the direction of Esprit Séguier—*le terrible prophète*, by fifty three men, all singing on their march one of Marot's psalms. The chateau was burned, and Du Chayla, after refusing his life on the score of renouncing his religion, was killed. Each one of the party struck a blow, crying "this for my father whom thou didst destroy at the wheel." "this for my brother sent by thee to the gallies," "this for my mother, dead of grief occasioned by your persecution" &c., &c. The bloody massacre of the archpriest and his servitors was followed by prayers, offered while kneeling around the dead bodies, and psalms.

Seguier now destroyed the crosses and all the insignia of catholicism in the churches. The torch was lighted and the whole region was exposed to the horrid devastations of a civil war. Seguier however, being seized, was burned alive, August 12, 1702. His place was soon filled by Laporte, who assumed the title of "Colonel of the children of God." He and his nephew had been soldiers in the king's army, and the military knowledge there acquired, with the extatic inspirations they claimed, gave them peculiar power. Churches were burned on all sides. Laporte Senior was killed at the head of his troop. His nephew Roland became the chief leader of the religious insurrectionists, under the title of "General of the children of God." He organized his army in five legions, properly divided. The army was singularly supplied with arms. "Their guns were unlike in form and calibre; the sabres, pikes, bayonets and swords were of all varieties." Each chief of a legion governed with absolute authority, and celebrated religious worship in his camp, baptized and performed marriage services. His commands were looked upon as orders from God. But we cannot go further in detail as to the circumstances of this religious war. It was bloody in the extreme. Each side, animated with religious fanaticism, destroyed those of the other party in the most ruthless manner. Finally a treaty was had at Nimes between Cava-

lier, the young Protestant general, and Marshall Villars, which allowed *not* the religious liberty for which they had been contending, but that Cavalier should be received as Colonel in the French army with a regiment of his men to be employed in the war on the Rhine and in Spain. Immunity for past deeds had been granted, but this was not what actuated Roland, and he rejected, with contempt, the treaty of Nimes. "You are foolish," said the bold prophet leader to the young chief, "you have forgotten that you are not the general; you have betrayed your brethren and should die with shame. You are nothing more than a vile agent of the Marshal. Go tell him, that I am determined to die sword in hand for the entire reestablishment of the Edict of Nantes." Finally Roland was calmed, and he wrote a letter to the Marshal stating the true conditions of peace. The prophet Salomon and Cavalier were the bearers of this letter,—the former declared the children of the Lord would not lay down their arms, unless free exercise of their religion was allowed them. The conference was broken up by the Marshal in a rage. Cavalier found the camp in full revolt against him. Ravanel, one of his principal officers taunted him with being a coward and a traitor. The officers cried "no peace without liberty of conconscience, and the return of our pastors, the reconstruction of our churches." The *general* was sounded, and the troops formed to start out again for the continuation of the war. Cavalier followed, begging and entreating them to change the plan, but to no purpose. The soldiers received his prayers in silence, and Ravanel with insult and sarcasm. Each drew his pistol on the other. The prophet Moise prevented the fratricidal contest. Cavalier at last bade adieu to his comrades and left them in disgrace. His history is told in few words. He became a colonel in the French army, was received at Versailles with honors, soon attached himself to the Dutch army, and finally died in the British service as a Major-general and Governor of the island of Jersey.

The brigade now under the command of Ravanel was

surprised at Marjevols and suffered the loss of two hundred men. But the close of the whole war was due to the death of Roland, by treachery. He was surprized at the Chateau of Castelnau, where he had been visiting Mlle de Cornelli, for whom he had a species of platonic love; endeavoring to escape he was killed by a ball from a carbine.

We close this portion of our article with an extract from Figuier: "Thus perished, at the age of thirty, he who had given to the Cenevole insurrection its regular organization, and had held in check, with three thousand peasants, two French Marshals and an army of sixty thousand men. Roland Laporte, General of the Children of God, says Peyrat, united the indomitable tenacity of Coligny and the useful and sombre enthusiasm of Cromwell. Being possessed of the stormy element of extacy, he made it the foundation and rule of an insurrection, which he organized, nourished, clothed, sheltered, for two years in the desert, despite the rage of men and seasons; contended with three thousand combatants, against hostile people, sixty thousand armed men, the Marshals of Louis XIV, and finally was only overcome by defection, treachery and death. What obscure man could, with such feeble means, attempt with more energy, a more gigantic effort? The insurrection, created by him, died with him; he was its intellect,—its soul. But if he was the head, Cavalier was, so to speak, the arm and the most valiant sword. Roland had not that dash (élan), that adventurous, inspired impetuosity, that rash and chivalric bravery, which, added to the charms of youth, made Cavalier the most graceful and heroic figure of the desert. Roland, of a more mature age, a more manly character, had also more solid and more perfect characteristics. By nature possessing calmness united with passion, cunning with boldness, calculation with enthusiasm. A man of intellect, rather than action, he accepted, without seeking them, the combats which were necessary, leaving to Cavalier the glory of sterile and bloody assaults. His victories inspired, as it seemed, the young lieutenant with the culpable ambition of usurping the su-

preme command. Roland preserved this, and not only did not take revenge, but selected him as his means of communication with Villars, and, even after his defection, wished to reconcile him with his brigade. Cavalier appeared indispensable to his triumph. What a deplorable recompense for human actions: faithlessness conducted Cavalier to fortune and celebrity; Roland, incorruptible, sealing his cause with his blood, only obtained an obscure martydom."*

Had Roland lived, the insurrection might have attained its much desired end. Ravanel, Castanet and some others were arrested, April 18, 1705; the two were fastened back to back and burned alive. The insurrection was practically at an end.

The general communication of the tendency to prophecy seemed to depend on some general influence, which affected the whole protestant population at the same time. This was particularly to be noticed with reference to all those who belong to the Du Serre period. The prophets became strong powers when the theocratic army was organized. The Chiefs of this army were selected in accordance with the degree they were enjoying the communication of the spirit. But after the army was disbanded, certain of the prophets repaired to London (Jean Cavalier (de Sauve), Elie Marion and Durand Fage may here be mentioned), and excited much curiosity by their convulsions and extatic crises. Elie Marion founded a school of prophecy there. He was surrounded by a phalanx, divided into twelve tribes, after the manner of the Israelites. The English, however, being uneasy about this mystical religion, expelled them from the country.

Let us look upon this religious epidemic carefully, so as to see whether physiological and psychological laws will explain the extatic illuminism, which certainly existed in so wonderful a form. In the greater number of cases, it consisted in intermittent attacks, and, in the intervals, the mental and bodily health did not appear much injured.

* Figuier. L'Histoire du Merveilleux. II, 389.

An attempt has been made to explain what the French call *theomanie extatique des calvinistes* by the supposition that hysteria or epilepsy were the causes. Figuier very properly thinks that neither affection will explain it, but that it was a disease sui generis. The facts seem to require such a conclusion.

The *crisis* came on as follows: after an exciting sermon, directing the mind to the persecution of the Church, the individual loosing consciousness of external objects, became a prey to high cerebral exaltation, At the end of a short time he fell to the ground, and was there seized with an epileptiform attack, the whole body was shaken and the muscles were convulsed. The convulsive agitations diminished, and then disappeared, being followed by calmness, when the individual arose and delivered his discourse, the burden of which was always the truths of the Protestant faith, the errors of Rome, and the re-establishment of their own churches. These discourses were delivered in the French of Languedoc, and began always with "*I tell thee, my child; I assure thee, my child.*" It was assumed that the Holy Spirit was really the speaker. When the discourse, was concluded, the prophet resumed his ordinary manner, rarely recollecting what he had said.

The extatic condition was sometimes excited by *insufflation* of a prophet. After he had finished his discourse, he approached the neophytes considered as fit candidates, breathed in the mouth of one and said, Receive the Holy Spirit. The novice went through the various stages, just described, and, after he had prophecied, breathed in turn in the mouth of another, and so the process went on, until all the chosen candidates were admitted. Often this condition of extatic convulsion was brought on a whole assembly, simply by an order or command from the prophet.

The incidents connected with the children attacked, show how the pliable thoughts of the young may be turned in any direction. "The sons and daughters of the Cevenese Protestants heard nothing but religious conversation, or biblical invocations destined to console them in their mis-

fortunes as persecuted religionists. Hence the same ideas and words quite naturally proceeded from the mouths of these children when they were a prey to the *crises* raging in their country." The elegant language employed was simply that which they had heard from the prophets.

During the extatic crises, they were insensible to physical pain, exhibiting a similar condition to that found among the Jansenist convulsionnaires, and already mentioned in this article.

With all this, there was an epidemic character. Catholics were some times seized, and when they obeyed—their discourses were denunciatory of the mass : their children always spoke in the language of the prophets when they were seized. Protestants who desired the extacies of their brethren were seized in the same way. Many came to scoff and went away prophets.

Hallucinations were common. "In the belief that they were invulnerable, they precipitated themselves" into the midst of the fight. They saw the most celebrated martyrs of their faith, and heard delightful concerts in the air.

From all these facts the conclusion is drawn that "this was a special epidemic disease of the nervous system. The causes producing it were evidently the long sufferings and excess of misfortune to which the Protestants of the South were exposed for a long series of years. * * Despair excited the brain, and delirium with an epileptiform affection, was added to the other ills."

Considerable similarity is found between these and the actions of the Anabaptists of the 16th century, and much analogy with those convulsions of the Saint Medard Jansenists. We cannot deny the evidence furnished us in either case,—and where mere physiological explanations can satisfy our minds as to their cause, we have no need to admit the special miraculous character which has been accorded them. Such religious epidemics may be expected whenever the Church has become so cold and lifeless, as to leave absolute latitude to all, or so intolerant as to establish persecutions. We think illustrations of what we are stating

could be found within the century now passing away. It would be a subject for astonishment, if a bird's eye view could be furnished of moral and religious epidemics, belonging to this century, but which have only differed from those referred to in this article, in degree but alas ! *not* in kind. To put this subject in its proper light would be doing a service to the age. Who will go forward in the path, so well-marked out by the author of the tract on the Anxious Bench ?

We had hoped to have noticed Figuier's article on *the divining rod*, but we must forbear. It may be that we shall take up that subject in another article. For the present we shall be content if our readers will have learned how "at different epochs almost identically the same diseases, delirium, and manifestations may occur, and how a superstitious spirit or a love of the marvellous will make haste to give them a supernatural character." The human race has always yearned for the supernatural. Says Bushnell, "Men can as well subsist in a vacuum, or on a metallic earth, attended by no vegetable or animal products, as they can stay content with mere cause and effect, and the endless cycle of nature. They may drive themselves into it, for the moment, by their speculations; but the desert is too dry, and the air too thin—they cannot stay. Accordingly, we find that just now, when the propensities to mere naturalism are so manifold and eager, they are yet instigated in their eagerness itself by an impulse that scorns all the boundaries of mere knowledge and reason; that is, by an appetite for things of faith, or a hope of yet fresher miracles and greater mysteries—gazing after the Boreal crown of Fourier, and the thawing out of the poles under the heat of so great felicity to come; or watching at the gate of some third heaven to be opened by the magnetic passes, or the solemn incantations of the magic circles; expecting an irruption of demons, in the name of science, more fantastic than even that which plagued the world in the days of Christ." A provision was made to satisfy this

desire after the supernatural in the mysteries of the Christian faith, which are to be received *as* communicated, and not to be warped to suit our own purposes. St Paul's injunction is of value now, as well as eighteen hundred years ago: Prove all things; hold fast that which is *good*.

L. H. S.

Baltimore, Md.

Art. III. ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

The Formulary of Faith of the Reformed Church on the Continent of Europe, known as the *Heidelberg Catechism*, was first published in the Palatinate, in the German language, by authority of the Elector, Frederick III. in January, 1563. A second and third edition followed each other in rapid succession during the same year, each being a modification of its predecessor. The third was issued in November (1563), and became the fixed and standard text, by which all subsequent editions were regulated.

The Catechism was translated into Latin by Joshua Lagus and Lambertus Pithopoeus, and published during the same year.

The year 1863 will acordingly be the three hundredth anniversary of the formation and adoption of the Heidelberg Catechism ; and the Synod of the German Reformed Church, a living, unbroken continuation of the Reformed Church of the Palatinate, and the only ecclesiastical body in America which holds this Catechism exclusively as its symbol of faith, has resolved to celebrate the event, with a degree of earnestness and solemnity commensurate with its dignity and historical significance.

Three committees were appointed by the Synod at Harrisburg, 1859, to make the necessary preparations. One is charged with the general duty of determining upon the proper manner of conducting the tricentennial celebration. The second is directed to prepare a critical standard edition of the Heidelberg Catechism in the original German and Latin, a revised English translation, and a historical introduction, to be published in one volume. The third is directed to prepare a digest of the Minutes of Synod, pre-

senting a complete yet condensed constitutional history of the German Reformed Church in America, from the first Synodical meeting held in 1749 to the present time.

In the prosecution of its work, the committee on the Tricentennial Catechism has come into possession of several old English versions, or, rather, as we think, several old editions of the first English version. As the publication of these editions will enable ministers and the laity in general to institute an independent comparison with the received English translation, and will be of great value to the members of the committee in making the revised translation, we herewith lay them before the Church in the pages of the *Review*.

The most important and interesting of these editions bears date, 1601, and is the translation by Dr. Parry, which was first printed in 1591. It is in the possession of Dr. Lewis H. Steiner, Baltimore, Md., who has furnished a copy for publication.

The next oldest is an edition of 1645 in the hands of the Right Rev. W. R. Whittingham, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland. Dr. Steiner has collated this edition with his own, and found *thirty-one* variations. These, though mostly unimportant, we print in the form of foot notes.

The third is an edition which we can trace back as far as 1728. The oldest copy is in the library of Rev. Thomas De Witt, D. D., of New York. We have a London reprint, dated 1851. The variations from the edition of 1601 are very many, and some of them important.

Our first intention was to publish only the text of Parry's translation, 1601, and give the variations of the edition of 1728 at the bottom of the page. But after proceeding with this work through several pages, we found the variations to be so numerous, that the execution of our plan would serve rather to produce confusion than facilitate an intelligent and satisfactory comparison. We have therefore abandoned it; and concluded to publish the two editions, 1601 and 1728, side by side.

To the edition of 1601 of Parry's translation, Dr. Steiner furnishes the following introductory notice:

This English version of the Heidelberg Catechism is taken from "THE SUMME OF CHRISTIAN RELIGION: *delivered by Zacharias Ursinus in His Lectures upon the Catechisme, authorised by the noble Prince Fredericke throughout his dominions. Wherein are debated and resolved the Questions of whatsoever pointes of moment, which have beene or are controversed in Divinitie. Translated into English first by D. Henrie Parry, amd lately conferred with the last and best Latine Edition of D. David Pareus Professor of Divinity in Heidelberge. At Oxford, Printed by Joseph Barnes, and are to be sold in Paules Church-yard at the signe of the Bible.* 1601."

We are indebted, to the kindness of the Rt. Rev. W. R. Whittingham, for the opportunity of examining Wood's Athenae Oxonienses, where we find (Vol. I, 352) the following notice of Bishop Henry Parry, the translator of the Catechism.

HENRY PARRY, son of Henry Parry, son of Will. Parry of Wormebridge in Herefordshire Gent. was born in Wilts 20 Dec. or thereabouts an. 1561; admitted Scholar of Corpus Christi Coll. 13 Nov. 1576 and Probationer 23 Apr. 1586, being then Master of Arts. Afterwards he was Greek Reader in that Coll. Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, Doctor of Divinity 1595, Dean of Chester in 1605 in the place of Dr. Will. Barlow promoted to the See of Rochester, and at length through Gloucester, was made Bishop of Worcester an. 1610. He was reputed by all of his time an able Divine, well read in the Fathers, a thoro-paced Disputant, and so eloquent a Preacher, that King James I always professed he seldom heard a better. The King of Denmark also, who was sometimes present at our King's Court, gave him a very rich ring for a Sermon that he Preached before him and King James at Rochester an. 1606. He hath published;

Concio de regno dei, in Matt. VI, 33. London 1606.

Concio de victoriâ Christiana in Apoc. III, 21. Oxon, 1593. Lond. 1606.

He also translated from English into Latin,

The summ of a Conference between Joh. Rainolds and Joh. Hart, touching the Head and Faith of the Church. Oxon, 1619.

Also from Latin into English,

A Catechism, wherein are debated and resolved the questions of whatsoever moment which have been, or are, controverted in Divinity. Oxon. 1591. Which Catechism was originally written by *Zach. Ursinus*

This worthy Bishop died of a Palsey at Worcester 12 Dec. in 1616 and was buried in a little Chappell joyning to the north side of the Door of the Cathedral Church at Worcester. In his Epitaph over his grave (a copy of which you may see in Hist. et Antiq. Univ. Oxon. lib. 2 p 238) he is characterized to be *trium linguarum cognitione, assidua verbi divini praedicatione, provida ecclesiae gubernatione, mentis pietate, morumque integritate spectatissimus,* &c.

The title-page of the London reprint of the edition of 1728 runs thus:

THE

HEIDELBERG CATECHISM

OF THE

REFORMED CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

(FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1563):

THE English Divines at the Synod of Dordrecht, G. Carleton, Bishop of Llandaff, J. Davenant (afterwards Bishop of Salisbury), Samuel Ward, T. Goad, and Walter Balcanquai, said of this Catechism,—"That neither their own, nor the French Church, had a Catechism so suitable and excellent; that those who had compiled it were therein remarkably endowed and assisted by the Spirit of God; that in several of their works they had excelled other theologians; but that, in the composition of this Catechism, they had outdone themselves."

LONDON:
WERTHEIM AND MACKINTOSH,
24 PATERNOSTER-ROW;
J. H. JACKSON, ISLINGTON GREEN.
M.DCCC.LI.

On the second page we have the "Contents," and a comparison with Nowell's Catechism as follows:

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Heidelberg Catechism.	Q. 1; p. 3
The First Part.—*Of the Misery of Man.*	Q. 3; p. 4
The Second Part.—*Of Man's Deliverance.*	Q. 12; p. 6
Of God the Father.	Q. 26; p. 10
Of God the Son.	Q. 29; p. 12
Of God the Holy Ghost.	Q. 53; p. 19
Of Justification by Faith.	Q. 59; p. 21
Of the Sacraments.	Q. 65; p. 23
Of Baptism.	Q. 69; p. 24
Of the Holy Supper of the Lord.	Q. 75; p. 26
The Third Part.—*Of Thankfulness.*	Q. 86; p 32
Of the Commands.	Q. 92; p. 33
Of Prayer.	Q. 116; p. 43

As the Reader may wish to compare this Catechism with that of Nowell, the following brief table will assist in so doing. The pages of Nowell's Catechism, as published by the Prayer-book and Homily Society, London, 1846, are here referred to.—

HEID. CATECHISM.		NOWELL'S CATECHISM.
Q. 3—11	may be compared with. pp.	32,33
12—58	" " "	35—75
59—64	" " "	79—81; 83, 84
65—80	" " "	109—121
81—85	" " "	122—126
86—60	" " "	76—78
91—113	" " "	9—29
114	" " "	82, 83
115	" " "	33, 34
119—126	" " "	85—108

Upon a careful examination of the two translations or editions, that of 1601 and 1728, we have come to the conclusion that the edition of 1728 is not a different translation, but rather a revision of Parry's translation. With this view of their relation to each other, we print the former with the running title of "Parry's Translation, Edition of 1601," and the latter simply "Edition of 1728."

E. V. G.

A CATECHISM

OF

Christian Religion.

Q. 1. What is thy only comfort in life and death.

A. That both in soul and body whether I live or die I am not mine own, but belong wholly unto my most faithful Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who by his precious blood most fully satisfying for all my sins, hath delivered me from all the power of the devil, and so preserveth me,* that without the will of my heavenly Father not so much as a hair may fall from my head, yea all things must serve for my safety. Wherefore by his Spirit also he assureth me of everlasting life, and maketh me ready, and prepared, that henceforth I may live to him.

Q. 2. How many things are necessary for thee to know, that thou enjoying this comfort mayest live and die happily?

A. Three. The first, what is the greatness of my sin and misery. The second, how I am delivered from all sin and misery. The third, what thanks I owe unto God for this delivery.

The First General Part of Catechism touching THE MISERY OF MAN.

Q. 3. Whence knowest thou thy misery?

A. Out of the Law of God.

Q. 4. What doth the Law of God require of us?

A. That doth Christ summarily teach us, Matt. xxii, 37–40. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first and the great Commandment, and the second is like unto this, Thou shalt love thy

* And to preserve me. Edition of 1645.

The Heidelberg Catechism

OF THE

REFORMED CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

1st Lord's-day.

1. Q. What is thy only comfort in life, and death?

A. That both in soul and body, whether I live or die, I am not mine own, but belong wholly unto my most faithful Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who, by his precious blood most fully satisfying for all my sins, hath delivered me from all the power of the devil, and so preserveth me that, without the will of my Heavenly Father, not so much as an hair may fall from my head: but rather on the the contrary all things must be subservient to my salvation. Wherefore by his Spirit also He assureth me of everlasting life, and maketh me ready and prepared, that henceforth I may live to Him.

2. Q. How many things are necessary for thee to know, that thou, enjoying this comfort, mayst live and die happily?

A. Three. The first, what is the greatness of my sin and misery. The second, how I may be delivered from all sin and misery. The third, what thanks I owe unto God for this deliverance.

THE FIRST PART.

2d Lord's-day.—*Of the Misery of man.*

3. Q. Whence knowest thou thy misery?

A. Out of the Law of God.

4. Q. What doth the Law of God require of us?

A. That doth Christ briefly teach us, Matt. xxii. 37—40. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first and the great command; and the second is like to this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor

neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hangeth the whole Law, and the Prophets.

Q. 5. Art thou able to keep all these things perfectly?

A. No truly. For by nature I am prone to the hatred of God, and of my neighbor.

Q. 6. Did God then make man so wicked and perverse?

A. Not so. But rather he made him good, and to his own Image, that is, endued with true righteousness and holiness, that he might rightly know God his Creator, and heartily love him, and live with him blessed for ever, and that to laud and magnify him.

Q. 7. Whence then ariseth this wickedness of man's nature?

A. From the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve; hence is our nature so corrupt, that we are all conceived, and born in sin.

Q. 8. Are we so corrupt that we are not at all apt to do well, and are prone to all vice?

A. Indeed we are: except we be regenerated by the Holy Ghost.

Q. 9. Doth not God then injury to man, who in the Law requireth that of him, which he is not able to perform?

A. No. For God had made man such a one, as he might perform it. But man by the impulsion of the Devil, and his own stubbornness, bereaved himself, and all his posterity of those divine graces.

Q. 10. Doth God leave this stubbornness and falling away of man unpunished?

A. No: but is angry in most dreadful manner, as well for the sins wherein we are born, as also for those which ourselves commit; and in most just judgment punisheth them with temporal and eternal punishments, as himself pronounceth; Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this Law to do them.

Q. 11. Is not God therefore merciful?

A. Yea verily he is merciful, but so that he is also just;

as thyself. On these two commands hang the whole law and the prophets.

5. Q. Art thou able to keep all these things perfectly?

A. By no means: for by nature I am prone to the hatred of God, and of my neighbor.

3D LORD'S-DAY.

6. Q. Did God then make man so wicked and perverse?

A. By no means: but on the contrary He made him good and after his own image, that is, endued with righteousness and true holiness, that he might rightly know God his Creator, heartily love Him, live happily with Him for ever, and that to praise and magnify Him.

7. Q. Whence then proceedeth this depravity of the human nature?

A. From the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve: hence is our nature become so corrupt, that we are all conceived and born in sin.

8. Q. Are we then so corrupt, that we are not at all apt to do well, and are prone to all vice?

A. Indeed we are: except we be regenerated by the Holy Ghost.

4TH LORD'S-DAY.

9. Q. Doth not God then do any injury to man, who in the Law requireth that of him, which he is not able to perform?

A. By no means. For God made man such a one, that he might perform it: but man, by the instigation of the Devil, and his own stubbornness, bereaved himself, and all his posterity, of those divine graces.

10. Q. Doth God leave this stubbornness and backsliding of man unpunished?

A. By no means: but on the contrary is angry, in a most dreadful manner, as well for the sins wherein we are born, as for those which we ourselves commit; and, in mostjust judgement, punisheth them with temporal and everlasting punishments, as Himself pronounceth: "Cursed be he that continueth not in all the words of the law to do them."

11. Q. Is not God then also merciful?

A. Yea verily, He is merciful, but so that He is also

wherefore his justice requireth, that the same which is committed against the divine majesty of God, should also be recompensed with extreme, that is, everlasting punishments both of body and soul.

The Second Part.

OF MAN'S DELIVERY.

Q. 12. Seeing then by the just judgment of God, we are subject both to temporal and eternal punishments; is there yet any means or way remaining, whereby we may be delivered from these punishments, and be reconciled to God?

A. God will have his justice satisfied: wherefore it is necessary that we satisfy either by ourselves, or by another.

Q. 13. Are we able to satisfy by ourselves?

A. Not a whit. Nay rather we do every day increase our debt.

Q. 14. Is there any creature able in heaven or in earth, which is *only* a creature, to satisfy for us?

A. None. For first God will not punish that sin in any other creature, which man hath committed.* And further, neither can that which is nothing but a creature, sustain the wrath of God against sin, and deliver others from it.

Q. 15. What manner of Mediator then and Deliverer must we seek for?

A. Such a one verily as is very man, and perfectly just, and yet in power above all creatures, that is, who also is very God.

Q. 16. Wherefore is it necessary that he be very man, and perfectly just too?

A. Because the justice of God requireth that the same human nature which hath sinned, do itself likewise make recompense for sin, but he that is himself a sinner, cannot make recompense for others.†

Q. 17. Why must he also be very God?

A. That he might by his God-head sustain in his flesh

---

* Which man had committed. Edition of 1645. † Cannot make a recompense for others. Edition 1645.

just. Wherefore his justice requireth, that the sin, which is committed against the most high Majesty of God, should also be recompenced with extreme, that is everlasting punishments both of body and of soul.

THE SECOND PART.

5TH LORD'S-DAY.—*Of Man's Deliverance.*

12. Q. Since then, by the just judgement of God, we are subject both to temporal and eternal punishments; is there yet any mean or way remaining, whereby we may be delivered from these punishments, and be reconciled to God?

A. God will have his justice satisfied: wherefore it is necessary that we satisfy, either by ourselves or by another.

13. Q. Are we able to satisfy by ourselves?

A. By no means: but rather, we do every day increase our debt.

14. Q. Is there any creature in heaven or earth, which is only a creature, able to satisfy for us?

A. None. For first, God will not punish that sin in any other creature, which man hath committed. And further, neither can that, which is nothing but a creature, sustain the wrath of God against sin, and deliver others from it.

6TH LORD'S-DAY.

15. Q What manner of Mediator and Deliverer must we seek for?

A. Such a one who is very man, and perfectly just, and yet in power above all creatures, that is, who at the same time also is very God.

16. Q. Wherefore is it necessary that He be very man, and perfectly just too?

A. Because the justice of God requireth, that the same nature of man which hath sinned, should itself likewise make recompense for sin: but he that is himself a sinner, cannot make recompense for others.

17. Q. Why must He at the same time also be very God?

A. That He might, by the power of his Godhead, sustain in his flesh the burden of God's wrath; and might

the burden of God's wrath, and might recover and restore unto us that righteousness and life which we lost.

Q. 18. And who is that Mediator which is together both very God, and a very perfectly just man?

A. Even our Lord Jesus Christ, who is made to us of God wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.

Q. 19. Whence knowest thou this?

A. Out of the Gospel, which God first made known in Paradise, and afterwards did spread it abroad by the Patriarchs and Prophets, shadowed it by sacrifices and other Ceremonies of the Law, and lastly accomplished it by his only begotten Son.

Q. 20. Is then salvation restored by Christ to all men, who perished in Adam?

A. Not to all: but to those only who by a true faith are engrafted into him, and receive his benefits.

Q. 21. What is true faith?

A. It is not only a certain knowledge, whereby I surely assent to all things which God hath revealed unto us in his word, but also an assured trust, kindled in my heart by the Holy Ghost, through the Gospel; whereby I make my repose in God, being assuredly resolved that remission of sins, everlasting righteousness, and life is given not to others only, but to me also, and that freely through the mercy of God, for the merit of Christ alone.

Q. 22. What are those things which are necessary for a Christian man to believe?

A. All thing which are promised us in the Gospel; the sum whereof is briefly comprised in the Creed of the Apostles, or in the Articles of the Catholic and undoubted faith of all Christians.

Q. 23. Which is the Creed?

A. I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth:

2. And in Jesus Christ, his only son, our Lord:

recover and restore unto us that righteousness and life which we had lost.

18. Q. But who is that Mediator, who is together both very God, and a true, perfectly just man?

A. Even our Lord Jesus Christ, "who is made to us of God wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption."

19. Q. Whence knowest thou this?

A. Out of the Gospel; which God first made known in Paradise, and afterwards did spread abroad by the patriarchs and prophets: shadowed it by sacrifices and other ceremonies of the Law: and lastly accomplished it by His only begotten Son.

7TH LORD'S-DAY.

20. Q. Is then salvation restored by Christ to all men who perished in Adam?

A. Not to all: but to those only, who by a true faith are engrafted into Him, and receive all his benefits.

21. Q. What is true faith?

A. It is not only a knowledge, whereby I firmly assent to all things, which God hath revealed unto us in His Word; but also an assured trust or confidence kindled in my heart, by the Holy Ghost, through the Gospel; whereby I acquiesce in God, being assuredly persuaded, that remission of sin, eternal righteousness and life, is given, not to others only, but to me also, and that freely, through the merits of Christ alone.

22. Q. What are those things which are necessary for a Christian to believe?

A. All things which are promised us in the Gospel: the sum whereof is briefly contained in the Creed of the Apostles; or in the Articles of the catholic and undoubted faith of all Christians.

23. Q. Which is that Creed?

A. i. I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth:

ii. And in Jesus Christ his only-begotten Son our Lord:

3. Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary:

4. Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, he descended into hell:

5. The third day he rose again from the dead:

6. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth* at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

7. From thence shall he come† to judge the quick and the dead.

8. I believe in the Holy Ghost.

9. I believe the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints.

10. The forgiveness of sins.

11. The resurrection of the body.

12. And the life everlasting. Amen.

Q. 24. Into how many parts is this‡ Creed divided?

A. Into three parts. The first is, of God the eternal Father, and our Creation. The second, of God the Son, and our Redemption. The third, of God the Holy Ghost, and our Sanctification.

Q. 25. Seeing there is but one only substance of God, why namest thou these three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost?

A. Because God hath so manifested himself in his word, that these three distinct persons are that one true and everlasting God.

Q. 26. What believest thou, when thou sayest, I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth?

A. I believe the everlasting Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath made of nothing heaven and earth, with all that are in them, who likewise upholdeth and governeth the same by his eternal counsel and providence; to be my

---

* On the right hand. Ed. 1645 † From thence he shall come. Ed. 1645.

‡ Into how many parts is the Creed divided? Edition 1645.

iii. Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost; born of the Virgin Mary:

iv. Suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead and buried; He descended into hell:

v. The third day He rose again from the dead:

vi. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty:

vii. From thence shall He come to judge the quick and the dead.

viii. I believe in the Holy Ghost.

ix. I believe an Holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints:

x. The forgiveness of sins:

xi. The resurrection of the body:

xii. And the life everlasting. Amen.

8TH LORD'S-DAY.

24. Q. Into how many parts is this Creed divided?

A. Into three parts. The first is of God the Father and our creation; the second, of God the Son and our redemption; the third, of God the Holy Ghost and our sanctification.

25. Q. Since there is but one only Divine Essence, why namest thou these three, the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST?

A. Because God hath so revealed Himself in His Word, that these three distinct Persons are that one true and eternal God.

9TH LORD'S-DAY.—*Of God the Father.*

26. Q. What believest thou when thou sayest, I BELIEVE IN GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY, MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH?

A. I believe the everlasting Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, (who hath made of nothing heaven and earth, with all that are in them, who likewise upholdeth and governeth the same by his eternal counsel and providence) to be my

God and my Father for Christ's sake, and therefore I do trust in him, and so rely on him, that I may not doubt but he will provide all things necessary both for my soul and body. And further whatsoever evils he sendeth on me in this troublesome life, he will turn them to my safety, seeing both he is able to do it, as being God Almighty ; and willing to do it, as being a bountiful father.

Q. 27. What is the providence of God?

A. The almighty power of God everwhere present, whereby he doth, as it were with his hand, uphold and govern heaven and earth, with all the creatures therein : so that those things which grow in the earth, as likewise rain and drought, fruitfulness and barrenness, meat and drink, health and sickness, riches and poverty, in a word, all things come not rashly or by chance, but by his fatherly counsel and will.

Q. 28. What doth this knowledge of the creation, and providence of God profit us?

A. That in adversity we may be patient, and thankful in prosperity, and have hereafter our chiefest hope reposed in God our most faithful Father, being sure that there is nothing which may withdraw us from his love, forasmuch as all creatures are so in his power, that without his will they are not able not only to do anything, but not so much as once to move.

The Second Part of the Creed.

OF GOD THE SON, THE REDEEMER.

Q. 26. Why is the Son of God called Jesus, that is, a Saviour?

A. Because he saveth us from all our sins : neither ought any safety to be sought for from any other, nor can elsewhere be found.

Q. 30. Do they then believe in the only Saviour Jesus, who seek for happiness and safety of the Saints, or of themselves, or elsewhere?

A. No. For although in word they boast themselves of him as their Saviour, yet indeed they deny the only Saviour Jesus. For it must needs be that either Jesus is

God and my Father for Christ's sake; and therefore I do so trust in Him, and so rely on Him, that I may not doubt that He will provide all things necessary both for my soul and body. And further, whatsoever evils He sendeth on me in this troublesome life, He will turn them to my safety; since both He is able to do it as being God Almighty, and willing to do it as being a bountiful Father.

10TH LORD'S-DAY.

27. Q. What is the Providence of God?

A. The almighty power of God, everywhere present, whereby He doth, as it were, with his Hand uphold and govern heaven and earth, with all the creatures therein: so that those things which grow in the earth,—as likewise rain and drought, fruitfulness and barrenness, meat and drink, health and sickness, riches and poverty,—in a word, all things come not rashly or by chance, but by his fatherly counsel and will.

28. Q. What doth this knowledge of the Creation and Providence of God profit us?

A. That in adversity we may be patient, and thankful in prosperity; and have hereafter our chiefest hope placed in God our most faithful Father; being sure that there is nothing which may withdraw us from His love; forasmuch as all creatures are so in His power, that without His will they are not able, not only to do anything, but not so much as once to move.

11TH LORD'S-DAY.—*Of God the Son.*

29. Q. Why is the Son of God called JESUS,—that is, a Saviour?

A. Because He saveth us form all our sins: neither ought any safety to be sought for from any other, nor can elsewhere be found.

30. Q. Do they then believe in the only Saviour Jesus, who seek for happiness and safety of the saints, or of themselves, or elsewhere?

A. No. For although in word they boast themselves of Him as their Saviour, yet in deed they deny the only Saviour Jesus. For it must needs be, that either Jesus is not a

not a perfect Saviour, or that they who embrace him as their Saviour with a true faith possess all things in him, which are required unto salvation.

Q. 31. Why is he called CHRIST, that is, Anointed?

A. Because he was ordained of the Father, and anointed of the Holy Ghost, the chief Prophet and Doctor, who hath opened unto us the secret counsel, and all the will of his Father concerning our Redemption; And the High Priest, who with that one only sacrifice of his body hath redeemed us, and doth continually make intercession to his Father for us. And a King, who ruleth us by his word and spirit, and defendeth and maintaineth that salvation which he hath purchased for us.

Q. 32. But why art thou called a Christian?

A. Because through faith I am a member of Jesus Christ, and partaker of his anointing; that both I may confess his name, and present myself unto him a lively sacrifice of thankfulness, and also may in this life fight against sin and Satan with a free and good conscience, and afterward enjoy an everlasting kingdom with Christ over all creatures.

Q. 33. For what cause is Christ called the only-begotten Son of God, when we also are the sons of God?

A. Because Christ alone is the coeternal and natural Son of the eternal Father, and we are but sons adopted of the Father by grace for his sake.

Q. 34. Wherefore callest thou him our Lord?

A. Because he, redeeming and ransoming both our body and soul from sins, not with gold nor silver, but with his precious blood, and delivering us from all the power of the Devil, hath set us free to serve him.

Q. 35. What believest thou, when thou sayest, he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary?

A. That the Son of God, who is, and continueth true

perfect Saviour, or that they who embrace Him as their Saviour, with a true faith, possess all things in Him which are required unto salvation.

12TH LORD'S-DAY.

31. Q. Why is he called CHRIST,—that is, Anointed?

A. Because He was ordained of the Father, and anointed of the Holy Ghost, the chief Prophet and Teacher; who hath opened unto us the secret counsel, and all the will of his Father concerning our redemption: and the High Priest; who, with that one only sacrifice of His body, hath redeemed us, and doth continually make intercession with His Father for us: and the eternal King; who ruleth us by His Word and Spirit, and defendeth and maintaineth that salvation which He hath purchased for us.

32. Q. But why art thou called a CHRISTIAN?

A. Because through faith I am a member of Jesus Christ, and partaker of his anointing, that both I may confess his Name, and present myself unto Him a lively sacrifice of thankfulness; also may in this life fight against sin and Satan with a free and good conscience, and afterward enjoy an eternal kingdom with Christ over all creatures.

13TH LORD'S-DAY.

33. Q. For what cause is Christ called the ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON OF GOD, when we also are the sons of God?

A. Because Chrish alone is the eternal and natural Son of the eternal Father; and we are but sons adopted of the Father, by grace, for his sake.

34. Q. Wherefore callest thou Him OUR LORD?

A. Because He hath redeemed both our body and soul from sin, not with gold nor silver, but with his precious blood, and hath delivered us from all the power of the devil, and hath hereby acquired a right to claim us as his own property.

14TH LORD'S-DAY.

35. Q. What believest thou when thou sayest, HE WAS CONCEIVED BY THE HOLY GHOST, AND BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY?

A. That the Son of God, who is and continueth true

and everlasting God, took the very nature of man, of the flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary, by the working of the Holy Ghost, that withal he might be the true seed of David, like unto his brethren in all things, sin excepted.

Q. 36. What profit takest thou by Christ's holy conception and nativity?

A. That he is our Mediator, and doth cover with his innocency and perfect holiness my sins, in which I was conceived, that they may not come in the sight of God.

Q. 37. What believest thou when thou sayest, He suffered?

A. That he all the time of his life which he led in the earth, but especially at the end thereof, sustained the wrath of God both in body and soul, against the sin of all mankind, that he might by his passion, as the only propitiatory sacrifice, deliver our body and soul from everlasting damnation and purchase unto us the favor of God, righteousness, and everlasting life.

Q. 38. For what cause should he suffer under Pilate as being his judge?

A. That he being innocent and condemned before a civil Judge, might deliver us from the severe judgment of God, which remained for all men,

Q. 39. But is there any thing more in it that he was fastened to the Cross, than if he had suffered any other kind of death?

A. There is more. For by this I am assured that he took upon himself the curse which did lie on me. For the death of the cross was accursed of God.

Q. 40. Why was it necessary for Christ to humble himself unto death?

A. Because the justice and truth of God could by no other means be satisfied for our sins, but by the very death of the Son of God.

Q. 41. To what end was he buried also?

A. That thereby he might make manifest that he was dead indeed.

and everlasting God, assumed the very nature of man, of the flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary, by the operation of the Holy Ghost; that He might also be the true seed of David, like unto his brethren in all things, sin excepted.

36. Q. What profit dost thou enjoy by Christ's holy conception and nativity?

A. That He is our Mediator, and doth cover with his innocence and perfect holiness my sins, in which I was conceived, that they may not come in the sight of God.

15th Lord's-day.

37. Q. What believest thou when thou sayest, He suffered?

A. That He, all the time of his life which He lived upon earth, but especially at the end thereof, sustained the wrath of God, both in body and soul, against the sin of all mankind, that He might by his passion, as the only propitiatory sacrifice, deliver our body and soul from everlasting damnation, and purchase unto us the favour of God, righteousness, and everlasting life.

38. Q. For what cause should He suffer under Pontius Pilate as his judge?

A. That He, being innocent and condemned before a civil judge, might deliver us from the severe judgment of God, which remained for all men.

39. Q. But is there not somewhat more in it, that He was fastened to the cross, than if He had suffered any other kind of death?

A. There is certainly more: For by this I am assured, that He took upon Himself the curse which did lie on me: for the death of the cross was cursed of God.

16th Lord's-day.

40. Q. Why was it necessary for Christ to humble Himself unto death?

A. Because the justice and truth of God could by no other means be satisfied for our sins than by the very death of the Son of God.

41. Q. To what end was He buried also?

A. That thereby He might demonstrate that He was really dead.

Q. 42. But since that Christ died for us, why must we also die?

A. Our death is not a satisfaction for our sins, but the abolishing of sin, and our passage into life everlasting.

Q. 43. What other commodity* receive we by the sacrifice and death of Christ?

A. That by the virtue of his death, our old man is crucified, slain, and buried together with him, that henceforth evil lusts and desires may not reign in us, but we may offer ourselves unto him a sacrifice of thanksgiving.

Q. 44. Why is there added, He descended into Hell?

A. That in my greatest pains, and most grievous tentations, I may support myself with this comfort, that my Lord Jesus Christ hath delivered me, by the unspeakable distresses, torments, and terrors of his soul, into which he was plunged both before, and then especially when he hanged on the cross, from the straits and torments of hell.

Q. 45. What doth the resurrection of Christ profit us?

A. First by his resurrection he vanquished death, that he might make us partakers of that righteousness which he had gotten us by his death. Again we are now also stirred up by his power to a new life. Lastly, the resurrection of our head Christ, is a pledge unto us of our glorious resurrection.

Q. 46. How understand you that, He ascended into heaven?

A. That Christ, his disciples looking on, was taken up from the earth into heaven, and yet still is there for our sakes, and will be, until he come again to judge the quick and dead.†

Q. 47. Is not Christ with us then until the end of the world as he hath promised?

A. Christ is true God, and true man: and so according to his manhood, he is not now on earth: but according to

* What other commodities. Edition 1645. † To judge the quick and the dead. Edition 1645.

42. Q. But since that Christ died for us, why must we also die?

A. Our death is not a satisfaction for our sins, but the abolishing of sin, and our passage into everlasting life.

43. Q. What other benefit do we receive by the sacrifice and death of Christ?

A. That by the virtue of his death our old man is crucified, slain, and buried together with Him: that henceforth corrupt inclinations and carnal desires may not reign in us, but that we may offer ourselves unto Him, a sacrifice of thanksgiving.

44. Q. Why is there added, He descended into hell?

A. That, in my greatest pains and most grievous temptations, I may support myself with this comfort; that my Lord Jesus Christ hath delivered me from the sorrows and torments of hell, by the unspeakable distresses, torments, and terrors of his soul, into which He was plunged, both before, and then especially, when He hung on the cross.

17th Lord's-Day.

45. Q. What does the Resurrection of Christ profit us?

A. First, by his *Resurrection* He vanquished death, that He might make us partakers of that righteousness, which He had purchased for us by his death. Again we are now also excited by his power to a new life. Lastly, the *Resurrection* of our head Christ, is a pledge unto us of our glorious resurrection.

18th Lord's-Day.

46. Q. How understand you that, He ascended into heaven?

A. That Christ (his disciples looking on) was taken up from earth into heaven, and is still there for our sakes, and will be, until He come again to judge the quick and the dead.

47. Q. Is not Christ then with us until the end of the world, as He hath promised?

A. Christ is true God, and true man: and so, according to his human nature, He is not now on earth; but, accord-

his godhead, his majesty, his grace, and spirit, he is at no time from us.

Q. 48. Are not by this means the two natures in Christ pulled asunder, if his humanity be not wheresoever his divinity is?

A. No: For seeing his Divinity is incomprehensible, and everywhere present, it followeth necessarily that the same is without the bounds of his human nature which he took to him, and yet is nevertheless in it,* and abideth personally united to it.

Q. 49. What fruit doth the ascension of Christ into heaven bring us?

A. First, that he maketh intercession to his Father in heaven for us. Next that we have our flesh in heaven, that we may be confirmed thereby, as by a sure pledge, that it shall come to pass, that he who is our head, will lift up us his members† unto him. Thirdly that he sendeth us his spirit instead of a pledge between him and us, by whose forcible working we seek after, not earthly, but heavenly things, where he himself is sitting at the right hand of God.

Q. 50. Why is it further said, He sitteth at the right hand of God?

A. Because Christ therefore is ascended into heaven, to show there that he‡ is the Head of the Church, by whom the Father governeth all things.

Q. 51. What profit is this glory of our Head, Christ, unto us?

A. First, that through his Holy Spirit, he poureth upon us his members, heavenly graces. Then that he shieldeth and defendeth us by his power against all our enemies.

Q. 52. What comfort hast thou by the coming again of Christ to judge the quick and the dead?

A. That in all my miseries and persecutions I look with my head lifted up, for the very same, who before yielded himself unto the judgment of God for me, and took away all

* And yet it is nevertheless in it. † Will lift up his members. ‡ To show thereby that he is. Edition 1645.

ing to his Godhead, majesty, grace, and Spirit, He is at no time absent from us.

48. Q. Are not by this means the two natures in Christ pulled asunder, if his human nature be not wheresoever his Divine nature is?

A. Not at all: for since the Divinity is incomprehensible, and everywhere present, it followeth necessarily, that the same is without the bounds of the human nature, which He assumed, and yet is nevertheless in it, and abideth personally united to it.

49. Q. What fruit doth the Ascension of Christ into heaven bring us?

A. First, that He maketh intercession with his Father in heaven for us. Next, that we have our flesh in heaven, that we may be confirmed thereby, as by a sure pledge, that it shall come to pass, that He who is our Head will lift up his members unto Him. Thirdly, that He sendeth us his Spirit instead of a pledge between Him and us, by whose efficacy we seek after, not earthly, but heavenly things, where He himself is sitting at the right hand of God.

19TH LORD'S-DAY.

50. Q. Why is it further said, HE SITTETH AT THE RIGHT HAND OF God?

A. Because Christ therefore is ascended into heaven, to show there, that He is the Head of the Church, by whom the Father governeth all things.

51. What profit is this glory of our head Christ unto us?

A. First, that, through his Holy Spirit, He poureth out upon his members heavenly graces. Then, that he shieldeth and defendeth us by his power against our enemies.

52. Q. What comfort hast thou by the COMING AGAIN OF CHRIST TO JUDGE THE QUICK AND THE DEAD?

A. That, in all my miseries and persecutions, I look, with my head lifted up, for the very same Saviour, who before offered Himself unto the judgement of God for me, and took away all malediction from me, to come Judge

malediction from me, to come Judge from heaven, to throw all his and my enemies into everlasting pains, but to translate me with all his chosen, unto himself, into celestial joys and everlasting glory.

Q. 53. What believest thou concerning the Holy Ghost?

A. First, that he is true and coeternal God with the eternal Father and the Son: Secondly, that he is also given to me, to make me through a true faith partaker of Christ and all his benefits, to comfort me, and to abide with me for ever.

Q. 54. What believest thou concerning the holy and catholic Church of Christ?

A. I believe that the Son of God doth from the beginning of the world to the end, gather, defend, and preserve unto himself by his Spirit and word, out of whole mankind a company chosen to everlasting life, and agreeing in true faith: and that I am a lively member of that company, and so shall remain for ever.

Q. 55. What mean these words, The communion of Saints?

A. First that all and every one, who believeth, are in common partakers of Christ and all his graces, as being his members. And then, that every one ought readily and cheerfully to bestow the gifts and graces which they have received, to the common commodity and safety of all.

Q. 56. What believest thou concerning remission of sins?

A. That God for the satisfaction made by Christ, hath put out all the remembrance of my sins,* and also of that corruption within me, wherewith I must fight all my life time, and doth freely endow me with the righteousness of Christ, that I come not at any time into judgment.

Q. 57. What comfort hast thou by the resurrection of the flesh?

A. That not only my soul, after it shall depart out of my

* All remembrances of my sins. Ed. 1645.

from heaven; to throw all his and my enemies into everlasting pains: but to translate me, with all his chosen, unto Himself, into celestial joys, and everlasting glory.

20TH LORD'S-DAY.—*Of God the Holy Ghost.*

53. Q. What believest thou concerning the HOLY GHOST?

A. First, that He is true and co-eternal God, with the eternal Father and the Son. Secondly, that He is also given unto me, to make me, through a true faith, partaker of Christ and all his benefits; that He may comfort me, and abide with me forever.

21ST LORD'S-DAY.

54. Q. What believest thou concerning the HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH OF CHRIST?

A. I believe that the Son of God doth, from the beginning of the world to the end, gather, defend, and preserve unto Himself by his Spirit and Word, out of whole mankind, a society chosen to everlasting life, and agreeing in true faith. And that I am a lively member of that society, and so shall remain for ever.

55. Q. What mean these words, THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS?

A. First, that all and every one who believe are in common partakers of Christ and all his graces, as being his members. And then, that every one ought readily and cheerfully to bestow the Gifts, which they have received, to the common benefit and salvation of all.

56. Q. What believest thou concerning the REMISSION OF SINS?

A. That God, for the satisfaction made by Christ, hath put out all the remembrance of my sins, and also of that corruption within me, wherewith I must fight all my lifetime; and doth freely bestow on me the righteousness of Christ, that I may not at any time come into judgment.

22D LORD'S-DAY.

57. Q. What comfort hast thou by the RESURRECTION OF THE FLESH?

A. That not only my soul, after it shall have departed

body, shall presently be taken up to Christ her head, but that this my flesh also, being raised up by the power of Christ, shall be again united to my soul, and shall be made like to the glorious body of Christ.

Q. 58. What comfort takest thou of the Article of everlasting life?

A. That forasmuch as I feel already in my heart the beginning of everlasting life, it shall at length come to pass, that after this life I shall enjoy full and perfect bliss, wherein I may magnify God for ever; which blessedness verily, neither eye hath seen, nor ear hath heard, neither hath any man in thought conceived it.

Q. 59. But when thou believest all these things, what profit redoundeth thence unto thee?

A. That I am righteous in Christ before God, and an heir of eternal life.

Q. 60. How art thou righteous before God?

A. Only by faith in Christ Jesus: so that, although my conscience accuse me, that I have grievously trespassed against all the commandments of God, and have not kept one of them: and further am as yet prone to all evil: yet notwithstanding (if I embrace these benefits of Christ with a true confidence and persuasion of mind) the full and perfect satisfaction, righteousness and holiness of Christ, without any merit of mine, of the mere mercy of God, is imputed and given unto me, and that so as if I neither had committed any sin, neither any corruption did stick unto me, yea as if I myself had perfectly accomplished that obedience, which Christ accomplished for me.

Q. 61. Why affirmest thou, that thou art made righteous by faith only?

A. Not for that I please God through the worthiness of mere faith, but because only the satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ is my righteousness before God: and I cannot take hold of it, or apply it unto myself any other way than by faith.

out of my body, shall presently be taken up to Christ its Head; but that this my flesh also, being raised up by the power of Christ, shall be again united to my soul, and shall be made like unto the glorious body of Christ.

58. Q. What comfort takest thou from the article of EVERLASTING LIFE?

A. That, for as much as I feel already in my heart the beginning of everlasting life, it shall come to pass, that after this life I shall enjoy full and perfect bliss, wherein I may magnify God for ever; which blessedness, "neither eye hath seen, nor ear hath heard, neither hath any man in thought conceived it."

23D LORD'S-DAY.

59. Q. But when thou believest all these things, what profit redoundeth thence unto thee?

A. That I am righteous in Christ before God, and an heir of eternal life.

60. Q. How art thou righteous before God?

A. Only by true faith in Christ Jesus. So that, although my conscience accuse me, that I have grievously trespassed against all the commands of God, and have not kept one of them, and, further, am as yet prone to all evil: yet notwithstanding (if I embrace these benefits of Christ with a true confidence of mind) the perfect satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ, (without any merit of mine, from the mere mercy of God) is imputed and given unto me, and that so as if neither I had committed any sin, neither any corruption did inhere in me; yea as if I myself had perfectly accomplished that obedience, which Christ accomplished for me.

61. Q. Why affirmest thou, that thou art made righteous by faith only?

A. Not that I please God through the worthiness of my faith: but because only the satisfaction, righteousness and holiness of Christ is my righteousness before God; and I cannot embrace or apply it unto myself any other way than by faith.

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

Q. 62. Why cannot our good works be righteousness, or some part of righteousness before God?

A. Because that righteousness, which must stand fast before the judgment of God, must be in all points perfect, and agreeable to the law of God. Now our works, even the best of them, are imperfect in this life, and defiled with sin.

Q. 63. How is it that our good works merit nothing, seeing God promiseth that he will give a reward for them, both in this life and in the life to come?

A. That reward is not given of merit, but of grace.

Q. 64. But doth not this doctrine make men careless and profane?

A. No. For neither can it be, but they which are incorporated into Christ through faith, should bring forth the fruits of thankfulness.

Of the Sacraments.

Q. 65. Seeing then that only faith maketh us partakers of Christ and his benefits, whence doth it proceed?

A. From the Holy Ghost, who kindleth it in our hearts by the preaching of the Gospel, and confirmeth it by the use of the Sacraments.

Q. 66. What are the Sacraments?

A. They are sacred signs and seals set before our eyes, and ordained of God for this cause,* that he may declare and seal by them the promise of his Gospel unto us, to wit, that he giveth freely remission of sins, and life everlasting not only to all in general, but to every one in particular that believeth, for that only sacrifice of Christ, which he accomplished upon the cross.

Q. 67. Do not then both the Word and Sacraments tend to that end, as to lead our faith unto the sacrifice of Christ finished on the Cross, as to the only ground of our salvation?

A. It is even so. For the Holy Ghost teacheth us by the Gospel, and assureth us by the Sacraments, that the salva-

* Ordained of God for his cause. Ed. 1645.

24TH LORD'S-DAY.

62. Q. Why cannot our good works be righteousness, or some part of righteousness before God?

A. Because that righteousness which must stand before the judgment of God, must be in all points perfect, and agreeable to the Law of God. But our works, even the best of them, are imperfect in this life, and defiled with Sin-

63. Q. How is it that our good works merit nothing, since God promises that He will give a reward for them, both in this life, and in the life to come?

A. That reward is not given out of merit, but of grace.

64. Q. But doth not this doctrine make men secure and profane?

A. No. For it is impossible that they who are incorporated into Christ through faith, should not bring forth the fruits of thankfulness.

25TH LORD'S-DAY.—*Of the Sacraments.*

65. Q. Since then that only faith maketh us partakers of Christ and all his benefits, whence doth this faith proceed?

A. From the Holy Ghost, who kindleth it in our hearts by the preaching of the Gospel, and confirmeth it by the use of the Sacraments.

66. Q. What are the Sacraments?

A. They are holy visible signs and seals ordained by God for this end, that He may more fully declare and seal by them the promise of his Gospel unto us: to wit, that, not only unto all believers in general, but unto each of them in particular, He freely giveth remission of sins and life eternal, upon the account of that only sacrifice of Christ which He accomplished upon the cross.

67. Q. Do then both the Word and Sacraments tend to that end, to lead our faith unto the sacrifice of Christ finished on the cross, as the only ground of our salvation?

A. It is even so. For the Holy Ghost teacheth us by the Gospel, and assureth us by the Sacraments, that the

tion of all of us standeth in the only sacrifice of Christ offered for us upon the cross.

Q. 68. How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in the New Testament?

A. Two. Baptism, and the Holy Supper.

Of Baptism.

Q. 69. How art thou admonished and assured in Baptism, that thou art partaker of the only sacrifice of Christ?

A. Because Christ commanded the outward washing of water, adjoining this promise thereunto, that I am no less assuredly washed by his blood and spirit from the uncleanness of my soul, that is, from all my sins, than I am washed outwardly with water, whereby all the filthiness of the body useth to be purged.

Q. 70. What is it to be washed with the blood and spirit of Christ?

A. It is to receive of God forgiveness of sins freely, for the blood of Christ, which he shed for us in his sacrifice on the Cross. And also to be renewed by the Holy Ghost, and through his sanctifying of us, to become members of Christ, that we may more and more die to sin, and live holy, and without blame.

Q. 71. Where doth Christ promise us that he will as certainly wash us with his blood and spirit, as we are washed with the water of Baptism?

A. In the institution of Baptism; the words whereof are these. *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. He that shall believe, and be baptized, shall be saved: but he that will not believe shall be damned.* This promise is repeated again, whereas the Scripture calleth Baptism, the washing of the new birth, and forgiveness of sins.

Q. 72. Is then the outward Baptism of water the washing away of sins?

whole of our salvation dependeth upon the only sacrifice of Christ, offered for us upon the cross.

68. Q. How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in the New Covenant?

A. Two, Holy Baptism, and the Holy Supper.

26TH LORD'S-DAY—*Of Baptism.*.

69. Q. How art thou admonished and assured in Baptism, that thou art a partaker of that only sacrifice of Christ?

A. Because Christ commanded the outward washing of water; adjoining this promise thereunto, that I am no less assuredly washed by His Blood and Spirit from the uncleanliness of my soul, that is, from all my sins, than I am washed outwardly with water, whereby all the filthiness of the body useth to be purged.

70. Q. What is it to be washed with the Blood and Spirit of Christ?

A. It is to receive of God forgiveness of sins freely for the blood of Christ, which He shed for us in his sacrifice on the cross. And also to be renewed by the Holy Ghost, and, through his sanctifying of us, to become members of Christ, that we may more and more die unto sin, and live holy and without blame.

71. Q. Where hath Christ promised that He will as certainly wash us with his Blood and Spirit, as we have been washed with the water of Baptism?

A. In the institution of Baptism; the words whereof are these: "Go, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not, shall be damned." This promise is repeated again, where the Scripture calleth baptism, "the washing of the new birth," and "forgiveness of sins."

27TH LORD'S-DAY.

72. Q. Is then the outward Baptism of water itself the washing away of sin?

A. It is not. For the blood of Christ alone cleanseth us from all sin.

Q. 73. Why then doth the Holy Ghost call Baptism the washing of the new birth, and forgiveness of sins?

A. God speaketh so not without great cause: to wit, not only to teach us, that as the filth of our body is purged by water, so our sins also are purged by the blood and spirit of Christ: but much more to assure us by this divine token and pledge, that we are as verily washed from our sins with the inward washing, as we are washed by the outward and visible water.

Q. 74. Are infants to be baptized also?

A. What else? For seeing they belong as well unto the covenant and church of God, as they who are of a full age; and seeing also unto them is promised remission of sins by the blood of Christ, and the Holy Ghost the worker of faith, as well as unto those of full growth, they are by Baptism to be ingrafted into the church of God, and to be discerned from the children of infidels, in like sort as in the Old Testament was done by circumcision, in place whereof* is Baptism succeeded in the New Testament.

Of the Lord's Supper.

Q. 75. How art thou in the Lord's Supper admonished and warranted, that thou art partaker of that only sacrifice of Christ offered on the Cross, and of his benefits?

A. Because Christ hath commanded me and all the faithful to eat of this bread broken, and to drink of the cup distributed, in remembrance of him, with this promise adjoined. First, that his body was as certainly broken and offered for me on the Cross, and his blood shed for me, as I behold with my eyes the bread of the Lord broken unto me, and the cup communicated to me; and further, that my soul is no less assuredly fed to everlasting life with his

* In the place whereof is Baptism. Ed. 1645.

A. It is not: For the blood of Jesus Christ alone, and the Holy Ghost, cleanseth us from all sin.

73. Q. Why then doth the Holy Ghost call Baptism, the washing of the new birth, and cleansing from sin?

A. God speaketh so not without great cause: to wit, not only to teach us, that, as the filthinesses of our body are purged by water, so our sins also are expiated by the Blood and Spirit of Christ. But much more to assure us by this Divine token and pledge, that we are no less truly washed from our sins with the inward washing, than we are washed by the outward and visible water.

74. Q. Are infants to be baptised also?

A. By all means: For since they belong as well unto the Covenant and Church of God, as they who are of full age; and since also unto them is promised remission of sins, by the blood of Christ and the Holy Ghost, the worker of faith, as well as unto those of full growth; they are by baptism (as a seal of the Covenant) to be engrafted into the Church of God, and to be distinguished from the children of Infidels, in like manner as was done by Circumcision under the old Covenant, in place whereof Baptism succeeded under the new Covenant.

28TH LORD'S-DAY.—*Of the Holy Supper of the Lord.*

75. Q. How art thou in the Lord's Supper admonished and assured, that thou art a partaker of that only sacrifice of Christ offered on the cross, and of all his benefits?

A. Because Christ hath commanded me, and all the faithful, to eat of this bread broken, and to drink of the cup distributed, in remembrance of Him, with these promises adjoined: First, that his body was as certainly broken and offered for me on the cross, and his blood shed for me, as I behold with my eyes the bread of the Lord broken unto me, and the cup communicated to me: And further, that my soul is no less assuredly fed to everlasting life with

body, which was crucified for us, and his blood, which was shed for us, than I receive and taste by the mouth of my body the bread and wine, the signs of the body and blood of our Lord, received at the hand of the Minister.

Q. 76. What is it to eat the body of Christ crucified, and to drink of his blood that was shed?

A. It is not only to embrace by an assured confidence of mind the whole passion and death of Christ, and thereby to obtain forgiveness of sins and everlasting life: but also by the Holy Ghost, who dwelleth both in Christ and us, so more and more to be united to his sacred body, that though he be in heaven, and we in earth, yet nevertheless are we flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones: and as all the members of the body are by one soul, so are we also quickened and guided by one and the same Spirit.

Q. 77. Where hath Christ promised, that he will as certainly give his body and blood so to be eaten and drunken, as they eat this bread broken, and drink this cup?

A. In the institution of his Supper, the words whereof are these: *Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the night that he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat, This is my body which is broken for you: this do you in remembrance of me. Likewise also he took the cup, when he had supped, and said, This cup is the new Testament in my blood: this do, as often as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye shew the Lord's death till he come.* This promise is repeated by St. Paul, when he sayeth: *The* cup of thanksgiving, wherewith we give thanks, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? For we that are many, are one bread and one body, because we all are partakers of one bread.*

Q. 78. Are then the bread and wine, made the very body and blood of Christ?

A. No verily. But as the water of Baptism is not turned

* This cup of Thanksgiving. Ed. 1545.

his body which was crucified for us, and his blood which was shed for us, than I taste by the mouth of my body the bread and wine, the signs of the body and blood of our Lord, received from the hand of the minister.

76. Q. What is it to eat the body of Christ crucified, and to drink his blood which was shed?

A. It is not only to embrace, by an assured confidence of mind, the whole passion and death of Christ, and thereby to obtain forgiveness of sins and eternal life; but also, by the Holy Ghost, who dwelleth both in Christ and us, more and more to be united to his sacred body: so that, though He be in heaven, and we on earth, yet, nevertheless, we are flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones. And, as all the members of the body are quickened and governed by one soul, so are we also by one and the same Spirit.

77. Q, Where hath Christ promised that He will as certainly give his body and blood* so as to be ate and drunk by believers, as they eat this bread broken, and drink this cup?

A. In the institution of His Supper, the words whereof are these: "The Lord Jesus in the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread: and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come."

This promise is repeated by St. Paul, when he saith, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many, are one bread and one body; because we are all partakers of of that one bread."

29TH LORD'S-DAY.

78. Q. Are then the bread and wine become the very body and blood of Christ?

A. Not at all: But, as the water of Baptism is not turned into the blood of Christ, nor is it the washing away

into the blood of Christ, but is only a sign and pledge of those things that are sealed to* us in Baptism: so neither is the bread of the Lord's Supper the very body of Christ: Although according to the manner of Sacraments, and that form of speaking of them, which is usual unto† the Holy Ghost, the bread is called the body of Christ.

Q. 79. Why then doth Christ call the bread his body, and the cup his blood, or the new Testament in his blood: and Paul also calleth bread and wine, the communion of the body and blood of Christ?

A. Christ not without great consideration speaketh so: to wit, not only for to teach us, that as the bread and wine sustain the life of the body, so also his crucified body, and blood shed, are indeed the meat and drink of our soul, whereby it is nourished to eternal life: But much more, that by this visible sign and pledge he may assure us, that we are as verily partakers of his body and blood through the working of the Holy Ghost, as we do receive by the mouth of our body these holy signs in remembrance of him: and further also, that that his suffering and obedience is so certainly ours, as though we ourselves had suffered punishments for our sins, and had satisfied God.

Q. 80. What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Popish Mass?

A. The supper of the Lord testifieth to us that we have perfect forgiveness of all our sins for that only sacrifice of Christ, which himself once fully wrought on the Cross: Then also that we by the Holy Ghost are grafted into Christ, who now according to his human nature is only in heaven at the right hand of his Father, and there will be worshipped of us. But in the Mass it is denied, that the quick and the dead have remission of sins for the only passion of Christ; except also Christ be daily offered of them by their sacrificers. Farther also it is taught, that Christ is bodily under the forms of bread and wine, and therefore

---

* Sealed unto us in Baptism. † Which is usual to the Holy Ghost. Ed. 1645.

of sin itself, but is a sign and pledge of those things; so neither is the bread of the Lord's Supper the very body of Christ, although, according to the manner of Sacraments, and that form of speaking of them which is usual unto the Holy Ghost, the bread is called the body of Christ.

79. Q. Why then doth Christ call the bread his body, and the cup his blood, or the new covenant in his blood? And Paul also calleth bread and wine "the communion of the body and blood of Christ"?

A. Christ speaketh so not without great reason: to wit, not only to teach us, that, as the bread and wine sustain the life of the body, so also his crucified body and shed blood are indeed the meat and drink of our souls, whereby they are nourished to eternal life; but much more that, by this visible sign and pledge, He may assure us, that w are as verily partakers of his body and blood, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, as we do receive by the mouth of our body, these holy signs in remembrance of Him. And further also, that his sufferings and obedience are so certainly ours, as though we ourselves had suffered punishment for our sins, and had satisfied God.

30TH LORD'S-DAY.

80. Q. What difference is there between the Supper of the Lord, and the Popish mass?

A. The Supper of the Lord testifieth to us, that we have perfect forgiveness of all our sins for that only sacrifice of Christ, which He himself once finished on the cross; then also, that we by the Holy Ghost are ingrafted into Christ, who now, according to his human nature, is only in heaven, at the right hand of his Father, and there will be worshipped by us. But in the mass it is denied, that the quick and the dead have remission of sins only for the passion of Christ; except also Christ be daily offered for them by the sacrificers. Further also it is taught, that Christ is bodily under the form of bread and wine, and

is to be worshipped in them: And so the very foundation of the Mass is nothing else than an utter denial of that only sacrifice and passion of Christ Jesus, and an accursed idolatry.

Q. 81. Who are to come unto the table of the Lord?

A. They only who are truly sorrowful, that they have offended God by their sins; and yet trust that those sins are pardoned them for Christ's sake: and what other infirmity* they have, that those are covered by his passion and death, who also desire more and more to go forward in faith and integrity of life: But hypocrites, and they who do not truly repent, do eat and drink damnation to themselves.

Q. 82. Are they also to be admitted to this† Supper, who in confession and life declare themselves to be infidels‡ and ungodly?

A. No. For by that means the covenant of God is profaned, and the wrath of God is stirred up against the whole assembly, wherefore the Church by the commandment of Christ and his Apostles, using the keys of the kingdom of heaven, ought to drive them from this Supper, till they shall repent and change their manners.

Q. 83. What are keys of the kingdom of heaven?

A. Preaching of the Gospel, and Ecclesiastical dicipline: by which heaven is opened to the believers, and is shut against the unbelievers.

Q. 84. How is the kingdom of heaven opened and shut by the preaching of the Gospel?

A. When by the commandment of Christ it is publicly declared to all and every one of the faithful, that all their sins are pardoned them of God, for the merit of Christ, so often as they embrace by a lively faith the promise of the Gospel: but contrarily is denounced to all Infidels and

* What other infirmities. † To the supper. ‡ Unbelievers. Ed. 1645.

therefore is to be worshipped in them. And so the very foundation of the mass is nothing else than an utter denial of that only sacrifice and passion of Christ Jesus, and an accursed idolatry.

81. Q. Who are to be permitted to come unto the Table of the Lord?

A. They only who are truly sorrowful that they have offended God by their sins: but who trust that those sins are pardoned them for Christ's sake; and what other infirmities they have, that those are covered by his passion and death: who also desire more and more to go forward in faith and integrity of life. But hypocrites, and they who do not truly repent, do eat and drink damnation to themselves.

82. Q. Are they also to be admitted to this Supper, who in confession and life declare themselves to be infidels and ungodly?

A. Not at all: For by that means the Covenant of God is profaned, and the wrath of God is stirred up against the whole Assembly. Wherefore the Church, by the command of Christ and his apostles, using the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, ought to hinder their approaching this Supper, till they shall have repented and changed their manners.

31st Lord's-day.

83. Q. What are the Keys of the kingdom of heaven?

A. Preaching of the Gospel, and Ecclesiastical Discipline: by which heaven is opened to believers, and is shut against unbelievers.

84. Q. How is the kingdom of heaven opened and shut by the Preaching of the Gospel?

A. When by the command of Christ it is publicly declared to all and every one of the faithful, that all their sins are pardoned to them by God, for the merits of Christ, so often as they embrace the promise of the Gospel by a lively faith. But, on the contrary, it is denounced against all infidels and hypocrites, that the wrath of God and eternal condemnation doth lie on them, so long as they go on in

Hypocrites, that so long the wrath of God and everlasting damnation doth lie on them, as they persist in their wickedness: according to which testimony of the Gospel, God will judge them, as well in this life, as in the life to come.

Q. 85. How is the kingdom of heaven opened and shut by Ecclesiastical discipline?

A. When according to the commandment of Christ, they who in name are Christians, but in their doctrine and life shew themselves aliens from Christ, after they having* been some time admonished, will not depart from their errors or wickedness, are made known unto the Church, or to them that are appointed for that matter and purpose, of the Church; and if neither then they obey their admonition, are of the same men by interdiction from the Sacraments shut out from the Congregation of the Church, and by God himself, out of the kingdom of heaven. And again, if they profess and indeed declare amendment of life, are received as members of Christ and his Church.

The Third Part.

OF MAN'S THANKFULNESS.

Q. 86. When as we are delivered from all our sins and miseries without any merit of ours, by the mercy of God only for Christ's sake, for what cause are we to do good works?

A. Because, after that Christ hath redeemed us with his blood, he reneweth us also by his Spirit to the image of himself: that we receiving so great benefits should shew ourselves all our lifetime thankful to God, and honor him. Secondly that every of us may be assured of his faith, by his fruit; And lastly, by our honest and good conversation, may win others unto Christ.

Q. 87. Cannot they then be saved, which be unthankful, and remain still carelessly in their sins, and are not converted from their wickedness unto God?†

* They have been some time. Ed. 1645. † From wickedness. Ed. 1645.

their wickedness. According to which testimony of the Gospel, God will judge them, as well in this life, as in the life to come.

85. Q. How is the kingdom of heaven opened and shut by Ecclesiastical Discipline?

A. When, according to the command of Christ, they,—who in name are Christians, but, in their doctrine and life, show themselves strangers to Christ, and, after they have been for some time admonished in a brotherly way, will not depart from their errors and crimes,—and made known unto the Church, or unto them that are appointed for that matter by the Church: and then, if they are not obedient to their admonition, they are by the same men to be forbidden the use of the Sacraments, whereby they are excluded from the congregation; and, by God himself, from the kingdom of heaven. And again,—if they profess, and indeed discover, amendment of life,—they are to be received as members of Christ and his Church.

THE THIRD PART.

32D LORD'S-DAY.—*Of Thankfulness.*

86. Q. Since we are delivered from all our sins and miseries, without any merit of ours, by the mercy of God, through Christ; for what cause are we to do good works?

A. Because, after that Christ hath redeemed us with his blood, He reneweth us also by his Spirit after his own image; that we, being deeply affected with such great benefits, should testify our gratitude to God all our lifetime: and that He should be magnified by us: and also, that every one of us might be assured of his own faith by its fruits: and lastly, that by our honest and good conversation we may win others unto Christ.

87. Q. Cannot they then be saved, who are unthankful, and remain secure in their sins, and are not converted from their wickedness unto God?

A. By no means. For as the Scripture beareth witness, neither unchaste persons, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor thieves, nor covetous men, nor drunkards, nor slanderers, nor robbers, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

Q. 88. Of what parts consisteth the conversion of men unto God?

A. It consisteth of the mortifying of the old man, and the quickening of the new man.

Q. 89. What is the mortifying of the old man?

A. To be truly and heartily sorry, that thou hast offended God by thy sins, and daily more and more to hate and eschew them.

Q. 90. What is the quickening of the new man?

A. True joy in God through Christ, and an earnest and ready desire to order thy life according to God's will, and to do all good works.

Q. 91. What are good works?

A. Those only which are done by a true faith, according to God's law, and are referred only to his glory: and not those which are imagined by us, as seeming to us to be right and good, or which are delivered and commanded by men.

Q. 92. Which is the Law of God?

A. God spake all these words:

1. I am the Lord thy God, which hath brought thee out of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, thou shalt have no other Gods in my sight.

2. Thou shalt make to thee no graven Image, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them: for I the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, and visit the sins of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and shew mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

3. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in

A. By no means: For, as the Scripture testifieth, neither unchaste persons, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor thieves, nor covetous men, nor drunkards, nor slanderers, nor robbers, shall obtain the kingdom of God.

33D LORD'S-DAY.

88. Q. Of what parts consisteth the Conversion of man unto God?

A. In the mortification of the old man, and the quickening of the new man.

89. Q. What is the mortification of the old man?

A. To be truly and heartily sorry that thou hast offended God by thy sins, and more and more to hate and fly from them.

90. Q. What is the quickening of the new man?

A. True joy in God through Christ, and an earnest and ready desire to order thy life according to the will of God, and to do all good works.

91. Q. What are good works?

A. Those only which are done by a true faith, according to the Law of God, and are referred only to his glory: and not those which are either imagined by us, as seeming to us to be right, or which are delivered and commanded by other men.

34TH LORD'S-DAY.

92. Q. What is the Law of God?

A. God spake all these words saying, "I am the Lord thy God, which hath brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

"I. Com. Thou shall have no other Gods before Me.

"II. Com. Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me: and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love Me, and keep my commandments.

"III. Com. Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord

vain: for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.

4. Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day, six days shalt thou labor and do all that thou hast to do, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt do no manner of works, thou, and thy son and thy daughter, thy man servant, and thy maid servant, thy cattle, and the* stranger that is within thy gate. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.

5. Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

6. Thou shalt do no murder.

7. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

8. Thou shall not steal.

9. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

19. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, nor his wife, nor his servant, nor his maid, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is his.

Q. 93. How are the commandments divided?

A. Into two Tables: whereof the former delivereth in four commandments, how we ought to behave ourselves towards God: the latter delivereth in six commandments, what duties we owe unto our neighbor.

Q. 94. What doth God require in the first commandment?

A. That, as dearly as I tender the salvation of my own soul, so earnestly should I shun and fly all Idolatry, sorcery, enchantments, superstition,† prayer to Saints, or any other creatures, and should rightly acknowledge the only and true God, trust in him alone, submit and subject myself unto him with all humility and patience, look for all good things from him alone, and lastly with the entire affection of my heart love, reverence, and worship him: so that I

* Thy stranger. † Superstitions. Ed. 1645.

thy God in vain: for the Lord will not hold him guiltless, that taketh his Name in vain.

"IV. Com. Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt do no manner of work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.

"V. Com. Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

"VI. Com. Thou shalt not kill.

"VII. Com. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

"VIII. Com. Thou shalt not steal.

"IX. Com. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

"X. Com. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's."

93. Q. How are these commands divided?

A. Into two Tables, whereof the former delivereth, in four commands, how we ought to behave ourselves towards God. The latter, in six commands, what duties we owe unto our neighbour.

94. Q. What doth God require in the first command?

A. That, as dearly as I value the salvation of my own soul, so earnestly should I shun and fly all idolatry, sorcery, enchantment, superstition, invocation of saints, or any other creatures. But should rightly acknowledge the only and true God, trust in Him alone; submit and subject myself unto Him with all humility and patience; look for all good things from Him alone. And lastly, with the entire affection of my heart, love, reverence, and worship Him. So

am ready to renounce and forsake all creatures rather than to commit the least thing that may be against his will.

Q. 95. What is Idolatry?

A. It is in place of that one God, or besides that one and true God, who hath manifested himself in his word, to make, or imagine, and account any other thing, wherein thou reposest thy hope and confidence.

Q. 96. What doth the second commandment require?

A. That we should not express or repesent God by any image, or shape, and figure or worship any otherwise than he hath commanded in his word himself to be worshiped.

Q. 97. May there then at all any Images or resemblance of things be made?

A. God neither ought nor can be represented by any means, and for the creatures, although it be lawful to express them, yet God forbiddeth notwithstanding their images to be made or had, as thereby to worship or honor either them, or God by them.

Q. 98. But may not images be tolerated in Churches, which may serve for the use of the common people?

A. No. For it is not seemly that we should be wiser than God, who will have his Church to be taught with the lively preaching of his word, and not with dumb images.

Q. 99. What doth God decree in the third commandment?

A. That not only by cursing, or forswearing, but also by rash swearing, we should not use his name despitefully or unreverently: neither should by silence or connivance be partakers of those horrible sins in others: but that we use the sacred and holy name of God ever with great devotion and reverence: that he may be worshiped and honored by us with a true and constant confession, and invocation of his name, and lastly in all our words and actions whatsoever.

Q. 100. Is it then so grievous a sin by swearing, or banning, to take the name of God in vain, as that God is also angry with them, who, as much as in them lieth, do no forbid or hinder it?

that I should renounce and forsake all creatures, rather than commit even the least thing that may be against his will.

95. Q. What is idolatry?

A. It is, in place of that one God, or besides that one and true God, who hath manifested Himself in his Word, to contrive or esteem any other thing, wherein thou shouldst repose thy hope.

35TH LORD'S-DAY.

96. Q. What doth the second command require?

A. That we should not represent God by any image, or figure, or worship Him in any other manner than He hath commanded himself to be worshipped in his Word.

97. Q. Are no images or resemblances to be made at all then?

A. God neither should, nor can be represented by any means. But as for the creatures, although it be lawful to express them, yet notwithstanding God forbiddeth their images to be made or kept, so as thereby to worship or honour either them, or God by them.

98. Q. But may not images be tolerated in churches, which may serve for books unto the unknowing part of the people?

A. Not at all: for we should not presume to be wiser than God, who will have his Church to be taught, not by dumb images, but by the lively preaching of his Word.

36TH LORD'S-DAY.

99. Q. What doth God decree in the third command?

A. That, not only by cursing or perjury, but also by rash swearing, we should not use His Name despitefully or irreverently; neither should, by silence or connivance, be partakers of those horrible sins in others: but should never use the sacred and holy Name of God, except with great devotion and reverence: that He may be worshipped by us with a true and stedfast confession and invocation of His Name, and lastly, in all our words and actions whatsoever.

100. Q. Is it then such an henious sin to take the Name of God in vain, by swearing or imprecations, that God is also angry with them who do not forbid or prevent it as much as they can?

A. Surely most grievous. For neither is there any sin greater, or more offending God, that the despiting of his sacred name. Wherefore also he would have this sin to be punished with death.

Q. 101. May a man swear also religiously and lawfully by the name of God?

A. He may: when as either the Magistrate exacteth it, or otherwise necessity requireth by this means the faith and truth of any man or thing to be ratified and established whereby both the glory of God may be advanced, and the safety of others procured. For this kind of swearing is ordained* by God's word, and therefore was well used of the Fathers both in the old, and new Testament.

Q. 102. Is it lawful to swear by Saints or other creatures?

A, No. For a lawful oath is an invocation of God, whereby we desire, that he, as the only searcher of hearts, bear witness unto the truth, and punish the swearer, if he wittingly swear falsely. But this honor agreeth to no creature.

Q. 103. What doth God command in the fourth commandment?

A. First that the ministry of the Gospel, and the schools of learning should be maintained: and that I, both at other times, and especially on holy-days, should frequent studiously divine assemblies, hear the word of God diligently, use the Sacraments, join my prayers with the common prayers of the assembly, and bestow something, according to my ability, on the poor. And further, that all my life time I be free from misdeeds and evil actions, yielding unto the Lord, that he may by his Holy Spirit work in me his work, and so I may begin in this life that everlasting Sabbath.

Q. 104. What doth God injoin us in the fifth commandment?

A. That we yield due honor, love and faithfulness to our Parents, and so to all, who bear rule over us, and submit

* Ordered by God's word. Ed. 1645.

A. Surely it is a most heinous sin. For neither is there any sin greater, or more offensive to God, than the contempt of His sacred Name. Wherefore also He would have this crime to be punished with death.

37TH LORD'S-DAY.

101. May not a man swear religiously by the Name of God?

A. He may: when either the magistrate demandeth it; or otherwise, when necessity requireth, that by this means faith may be confirmed and truth established; whereby both the glory of God may be illustrated, and the safety of others consulted. For this kind of swearing is founded upon the Word of God; and therefore was justly used, even by the saints, both in the Old and New Testament.

102. Q. Is it lawful to swear by saints, or other creatures?

A. No: for a lawful oath is an invocation of God, whereby we desire that He, as the only searcher of hearts, bear witness unto the truth, and punish the swearer, if he knowingly swear falsely. But this honour is due to no creature.

38TH LORD'S-DAY.

103. Q. What doth God require in the fourth command?

A. First, that the ministry of the Gospel, and the schools of learning should be maintained: and that I, especially on the Sabbath, frequent studiously divine assemblies; hear the Word of God diligently; use the Sacraments, join my prayers with the public prayers of the assembly; and bestow something, according to my ability, on the poor. And further, that all my life I be free from evil actions, yielding myself unto the Lord, that He may by his Holy Spirit work in me his own work, and so I may begin, in this life, that everlasting Sabbath.

39TH LORD'S DAY.

104. Q. What doth God enjoin in the fifth command?

A. That we should yield due honour, love, and fidelity to our parents, and also to all who bear rule over us; and

ourselves with such obedience, as is meet, to their faithful commandments and chastisements: And further also, that by our patience we bear and suffer their vices and manners, ever thinking with ourselves that God will govern and guide us by their hand.*

Q. 105. What doth God exact in the sixth commandment?

A. That neither in thought, nor in gesture, much less in deed, I reproach, hate, or harm, or kill my neighbor, either by myself, or by another: but I cast away all desire of revenge. Furthermore, that I hurt not myself, or cast myself wittingly into any danger. Wherefore also that murders might not be committed, he hath armed the Magistrate with the sword.

Q. 106. But this commandment seemeth to forbid murder only.

A. But in forbidding murder, God doth further teach that he hateth the root and cause of murder, to wit, envy, hatred, and desire of revenge, and doth account them all for murder.‡

Q. 107. Is it enough that we kill no man in such sort as hath been said?

A. It is not enough. For when God condemneth anger, envy, hatred, he requireth that we love our neighbor as ourselves: and that we use humanity, lenity, courtesy, patience, and mercy towards him, and turn away from him, as much as we may, whatsoever may be hurtful unto him: In a word, that we be† so affected in mind, as that we stick not to do good also unto our enemies.

Q. 108. What is the meaning of the seventh commandment?

A. That God hath in execration all turpitude and filthiness, and therefore we also must utterly hate and detest it, and contrariwise live temperately, modestly, and chastely, whether we live in holy wedlock, or in single life.

---

* By their hands. ‡ Cause of murders. † That we may be so affected. Ed. 1645.

should submit ourselves to their faithful commands and chastisements with such obedience as becomes us: and further also, that by our patience we should bear with their vices and manners, ever reflecting upon this, that it is the will of God to lead and govern us by their hand.

40th Lord's-day.

105. Q. What doth God require in the sixth command?

A. That neither in thought, words, gestures, or deeds, should I either affront, hate, hurt or kill my neighbour, either by myself, or by another; but cast away all desire of revenge. Moreover, that I hurt not myself, nor cast myself knowingly into any danger. Wherefore also God hath armed the magistrate with the sword, that murders should not be committed.

106. Q. But this command seemeth to forbid murder only.

A. But, in forbidding murder, God doth further teach, that He hateth the root and cause of murder; to wit, anger, envy, hatred, and desire of revenge, and doth account them all for murder.

107. Q. But is it enough that we kill no man in the manner mentioned above?

A. It is not enough. For, when God condemneth anger, envy, and hatred, He requireth that we should love our neighbor as ourselves, and that we should use humanity, lenity, courtesy, patience, and mercy towards him; and should divert whatever might be hurtful to him, to the utmost of our power: in a word, that we should be so disposed in our minds, as to make no scruple to do good, even to our enemies.

41st Lord's-day.

108. Q. What is the meaning of the seventh command?

A. That God holdeth in execration all uncleanness and filthiness, and therefore we also must utterly hate and detest it; and on the contrary that it becomes us to live temperately, modestly, and chastely, whether we live in holy wedlock or in single life.

Q. 109. Forbiddeth God nothing else in this commandment, but adultery, and such kinds of uncleanness?

A. Seeing both our body and soul are the Temples of the Holy Ghost, God will have us to possess both in purity and holiness. And therefore deeds, gestures, words, thoughts, filthy lusts, and whatsoever enticeth a man unto these, all that he wholly forbiddeth.

Q. 110. What doth God forbid in the eighth commandment?

A. Not only those thefts, and robberies, which the Magistrate punisheth; but by the name of theft he comprehendeth whatsoever evil crafts, fetches, and devices, whereby we seek after other mens goods, and endeavor by force, or with some shew of right to convey them over unto ourselves: of which sort are, false weights, false ells, uneven measures, deceitful merchandize, counterfeit coin, usury, or any other way or means of furthering our estate, which God hath forbidden. To these we may add all covetousness, and the manifold waste and abusing of God's gifts.

Q. 111. What are those things which God here commandeth?

A. That to my power I help and further the commodities and profit of my neighbor: and that I so deal with him, as I would desire to be dealt with myself: and that I do my own work painfully, and faithfully, that I may thereby help others also who are distressed with any need or calamity.

Q. 112. What doth the ninth commandment exact?

A. That I bear no false witness against any man, neither falsify any man's words, neither backbite or reproach any man, nor condemn any man rashly or unheard; but avoid and shun with all carefulness all kind of lies, and deceit, as the proper works of the Devil, except I mean to stir up against me the most grievous wrath of God: And that in judgments and other affairs I follow the truth, and freely and constantly profess the matter as it indeed is: And moreover defend and encrease, as much as in me lieth, the good name and estimation of others.

109. Q. Doth God forbid nothing else in this command but adultery, and such kinds of uncleanness?

A. Since both our body and soul are the temples of the Holy Ghost, God will have us to possess both in purity and holiness; and therefore He wholly forbiddeth all filthy deeds, gestures, speeches, thoughts, lusts, and whatsoever enticeth man unto these.

42D LORD'S-DAY.

110. Q. What doth God forbid in the eighth command?

A. Not only those thefts and robberies which the magistrate punisheth: but, under the name of theft, He comprehendeth whatsoever evil crafts and tricks, whereby we seek after other men's goods, and endeavour by force, or with some show of right, to convey them over unto ourselves: of which sort are false weights, false ells, unequal measures, deceitful merchandise, counterfeit coin, usury, or any other way or means of furthering our estate, which God hath forbidden. To these we may add all covetousness, and the manifest waste and abuse of God's gifts.

111. Q. What are those things which God here commandeth?

A. That, according to my power, I help and further the benefit and advantage of my neighbour: and that I deal so with him as I would desire to be dealt with myself: that, plying my own business faithfully and industriously, I may be able to relieve the necessities of others.

43D LORD'S-DAY.

112. Q. What doth the ninth command require?

A. That I should not bear false witness against any man: neither falsify any man's words; neither backbite or reproach any man, nor condemn any man rashly or unheard; but most carefully avoid all kinds of lies and deceit, as the proper works of the devil: unless I would stir up against myself the most grievous wrath of God. And that, in judgements and other affairs, I should follow the truth, and freely and constantly profess the matter, as it is indeed; and, moreover, should defend and propagate, as much as I am able, the good name and reputation of others.

Q. 113. What doth the tenth commandment forbid?

A. That our hearts be not at any time moved by the least desire, or cogitation against any commandment of God; but that continually, and from our heart we detest all sin, and contrarily delight in all righteousness.

Q. 114. But can they, who are converted unto God, perfectly observe and keep these commandments?

A. No: But even the holiest of men* as long as they live have only small beginnings of this obedience: yet so that they begin with an earnest and unfeigned desire and endeavor to live not according to some only, but according to all the commandments of God.

Q. 115. Why will God then have his law to be so exactly and severely preached, seeing there is no man in this life, who is able to keep it?

A. First that all our lifetime we more and more acknowledge the great proneness of our nature to sin, and so much the more greedily desire remission of sins and righteousness in Christ: Secondly, that we being doing of this always, and always thinking of that, implore and crave of the Father the grace of his Holy Spirit, whereby we may daily more and more be renewed to the image and likeness of God, until at length after we are departed out of this life, we may joyfully attain unto that perfection which is proposed unto us.

OF PRAYER.

Q. 116. Wherefore is prayer necessary for Christians?

A. Because it is the chief part of that thankfulness which God requireth of us. And also because God giveth them only his grace and Holy Spirit, who with unfeigned groanings beg them continually of him, and yield him thanks for them.

Q. 117. What is required unto that prayer, which shall please God, and be heard of him?

* The holiest men. Ed. 1645.

44TH LORD'S-DAY.

113. Q. What doth the tenth command forbid?

A. That our hearts should not at any time be drawn aside by the least desire or thought from any command of God: but that continually and from our heart we detest all sin, and on the contrary delight in all righteousness.

114. Q. But can they who are converted unto God perfectly keep these commands?

A. Not at all: but even the holiest men, as long as they live, have only small beginnings of this obedience: yet so, that they begin, with an earnest and unfeigned desire and endeavour, to live, not according to some only, but according to all the commands of God.

115. Q. Why will God then have his Law to be so exactly and severely preached, since there is no man in this life who is able to keep it?

A. First, that all our life-time we may more and more acknowledge the great propensity of our nature to sin, and so much the more earnestly pray for the remission of sins, and righteousness in Christ. Moreover that we, perpetually doing the last, and reflecting upon the first, should also implore from the Father the grace of His Holy Spirit, by which we may, day by day, be more and more renewed after the image of God, until at length, after we are departed out of this life, we may joyfully attain unto that perfection which is proposed unto us.

45TH LORD'S-DAY.—*Of Prayer.*

116. Q. Wherefore is prayer necessary for Christians?

A. Because it is the chief part of that thankfulness which God requireth of us: and also because God vouchsafeth his grace and Holy Spirit only to those who with unfeigned groanings beg them continually of Him, and render Him thanks for them.

117. Q. What is required in that prayer, which will please God, and be heard of Him?

A. That we ask of the only true God, who hath manifested himself in his word, all things, which he hath commanded to be asked of him, with a true affection and desire of our heart, and, through an inward feeling of our need and misery, cast ourselves down prostrate in the presence of his divine Majesty, and build ourselves on this sure foundation, that we, though unworthy, yet for Christ's sake are certainly heard of God, even as he hath promised us in his word.

Q. 118. What are those things which he commandeth us to ask of him?

A. All things necessary both for soul and body; which our Lord Jesus Christ hath comprised in that prayer which himself hath taught us.

Q. 119. What prayer is that?

A. Our Father, which art in heaven: Hallowed be thy name: Thy kingdom come: Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven: Give us this day our daily bread: And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; For thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, for ever, and ever: Amen.

120. Q. Why doth Christ teach us to call God our Father?

A. That presently in the very entrance and beginning of the prayer, he might stir up in us such a reverence and confidence in God, as is meet for the sons of God; which must be the ground and foundation of our prayer: to wit, that God through Christ is made our Father, and will much less deny unto us those things, which we ask of him with a true faith, than our earthly Parents deny unto us earthly things.

Q. 121. Why is that added: which art in heaven?

A. That we should ask of the only true God, who hath revealed Himself in His Word, all things which He hath commanded to be asked of Him, with a true affection of heart; and, through an inward feeling of our need and misery, should humbly prostrate ourselves in the presence of the Divine Majesty; and rest ourselves on this sure foundation, that we, though unworthy, yet for Christ's sake, are certainly heard of God, even as He hath promised us in his Word.

118. Q. What are those things which He commanded us to ask of Him?

A. All things necessary both for soul and body: which our Lord Jesus Christ hath comprehended in that prayer which He himself hath taught us.

119. Q. What prayer is that?

A. Our Father which art in heaven:

1. Hallowed be thy Name:
2. Thy kingdom come:
3. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven:
4. Give us this day our daily bread:
5. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us:
6. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil:

For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

48TH LORD'S-DAY.

120. Q. Why doth Christ teach us to address God thus,—OUR FATHER?

A. That immediately, in the very beginning of prayer, He might excite in us such a reverence for, and confidence in God as becomes the sons of God; which ought to be the ground and foundation of our prayer: to wit, that God is become our Father through Christ, and will much less deny unto us those things which we ask of Him with a true faith, than our parents will deny unto us earthly good things.

121. Q. Why is it added, WHICH ART IN HEAVEN?

A. That we conceive not basely or terrenely of God's heavenly majesty: And also that we look for and expect from his Omnipotency, whatsoever things are necessary for our soul and body.

Q. 122. What is the first petition?

A. Hallowed be thy name: that is, Grant us first to know thee aright, and to worship, praise, and magnify thy almightiness, goodness, justice, mercy, and truth, shining in all thy works. And further also to direct our whole life, thoughts, words, and works to this end, that thy most holy name be not reproached for us, but rather be renowned with honor and praises.

Q. 123. What is the second petition?

A. Let thy kingdom come: that is, rule us so by thy word* and Spirit, that we may humble and submit ourselves more and more unto thee. Preserve and encrease thy Church, destroy the works of the Devil and all power that lifteth up itself against thy Majesty: make all those counsels frustrate and void, which are taken against thy word, until at length thou reign fully and perfectly, when thou shalt be all in all.

Q. 124. What is the third petition?

A. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven: that is, grant that we and all men, renouncing and forsaking our own will, may readily and without any grudging obey thy will, which only is holy: and that so every of us may faithfully and cheerfully perform that duty and charge which thou hast committed unto us, even as the blessed Angels do in heaven.

Q. 125. What is the fourth petition?

A. Give us this day our daily bread: that is, give unto us all things, which are needful for this life, that by them we may acknowledge and confess thee to be the only foun-

* Rule us by thy word. Ed. 1645.

A. Lest we should conceive anything low or earthly concerning the heavenly majesty of God; and also that we should expect from his almighty power whatever things are necessary for soul and body.

47TH LORD'S-DAY.

122. Q. Which is the first petition?

A. HALLOWED BE THY NAME. That is, grant us first to know Thee aright, and to worship, praise and magnify thy almightiness, wisdom, goodness, justice, mercy, and truth, shining forth in all thy works. And further also, that we may always order our whole life, thoughts, words, and works to this end, that thy most holy Name may not be reproached upon our account, but rather be renowned with honour and praises.

48TH LORD'S-DAY.

123. Q. Which is the second petition?

A. THY KINGDOM COME. That is, rule us so by thy Word and Spirit, that we may submit ourselves more and more unto Thee: preserve and increase thy Church: destroy the works of the devil, and every power that exalteth itself against thy Majesty: frustrate all those counsels, which are taken against thy Word: until at length Thou mayest reign fully and perfectly, when Thou shalt be all in all.

49TH LORD'S-DAY.

124. Q. Which is the third petition?

A. THY WILL BE DONE IN EARTH AS IT IS IN HEAVEN. That is, grant that we and all men, renouncing our own will, may readily and without any murmuring obey thy will, which is only holy: and that so every one of us may faithfully and cheerfully perform that duty and charge which Thou hast committed unto us, even as the angels do in heaven.

50TH LORD'S-DAY.

125. Q. Which is the fourth petition?

A. GIVE US THIS DAY OUR DAILY BREAD. That is, provide us with us with all things necessary for this life, that by them we may acknowledge and confess Thee to be the

tain, from whence all good things flow, and all our care and industry, and even thine own gifts to be unfortunate and noisome unto us, except thou bless them, wherefore grant that turning our trust away from all creatures, we place and repose it in thee alone.

Q. 126. What is the fifth petition?

A. Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us: that is, Even for the blood of Christ do not impute unto us most miserable and wretched sinners all our offences, neither that corruption which still cleaveth unto us: even as we also feel this testimony of thy grace in our hearts, that we steadfastly purpose unfeignedly from our heart* to pardon and forgive all those, who have offended us.

Q. 127. What is the sixth petition?

A. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: that is, because we ourselves are so feeble and weak by nature, that we cannot stand so much as one moment or instant, and our most deadly enemies, Satan, the world, and our own flesh, do instantly oppugn and assault us: uphold thou us, and establish and strengthen us by the might of thy Spirit, that we may not in this spiritual combat yield as vanquished, but may so long stoutly withstand them, until at length we get full and perfect victory.

Q. 128. How concludest thou this prayer?

A. For thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, for ever: that is, we ask and crave all things of thee, because, seeing both thou art our king, and Almighty, thou art both willing and able to give them all unto us. And these things we therefore ask, that out of them, not to us, but unto Thy holy name all glory may redound.

Q. 129. What meaneth this particle, Amen?

A. That the thing is sure and out of doubt; For my prayer is much more certainly heard of God, than I feel in my heart, that I unfeignedly desire the same.

Soli Deo Laus et Gloria.

*From our hearts. Ed. 1645.

only fountain from whence all good things flow; and that all our care and industry, and even thine own gifts, would be unhappy and hurtful unto us, except Thou shouldest bless them. Wherefore, grant, that, withdrawing our trust from all creatures, we place it in Thee alone.

51ST LORD'S-DAY.

126. Q. Which is the fifth petition?

A. FORGIVE US OUR TRESPASSES, AS WE FORGIVE THEM THAT TRESPASS AGAINST US. That is, for the sake of the blood of Christ, do not impute unto us most miserable sinners, all our offences, neither that corruption which still cleaveth unto us: even as we also feel this testimony of thy grace in our hearts, that we are firmly resolved to forgive from the heart all those who have offended us.

52D LORD'S-DAY.

127. Q. Which is the sixth petition?

A. LEAD US NOT INTO TEMPTATION, BUT DELIVER US FROM EVIL. That is, because we ourselves are so feeble and weak by nature, that we cannot stand so much as one moment, but our most deadly enemies, Satan, the world, and our own flesh, do constantly assault us; uphold Thou us, and establish us by the might of thy Spirit, that we may not yield in this spiritual combat, but may so long strenuously resist them, until at length we obtain a complete victory.

128. Q. How concludest thou thy prayer?

A. FOR THINE IS THE KINGDOM, AND THE POWER, AND THE GLORY, FOR EVER. That is, we ask all these things of Thee, because, since Thou art both our *King*, and *Almighty*, Thou art both willing and able to give them all unto us. And these things we therefore ask, that, out of them, all glory may redound, not unto us, but unto thy holy Name.

129. Q. What meaneth this particle AMEN?

A. AMEN signifies, let it be done, or let it be truly accomplished. For my prayer is much more certainly heard of God, than I feel in my heart, that I unfeignedly desire the same.

ART. IV.—OUR ALUMNI ASSOCIATION.

Twenty years ago the Graduates of Marshall College, at that time numbering less than twenty names, met at Mercersburg, Pa., and resolved to organize the "Association of the Alumni of Marshall College." Rev. A. S. Young was their first President, and Rev. G. W. Williard was their Secretary. A committee, consisting of Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, E. V. Gerhart, M. Kieffer, S. H. Reid, and R. P. Little, was appointed to draft a constitution for the government of the Association, and report at the next commencement, in 1841.

Among the main objects of the Association, we find the cultivation of personal esteem and friendship, the strengthening of the bonds of literary brotherhood, and the promotion of the common interests of their Alma Mater, set forth in the first constitution. All regular graduates of Marshall College were entitled to membership. The annual meeting was to be held on Tuesday preceding the College commencement. And provision was made for the delivery of an annual address. There were the names of seventeen members signed to this constitution at the meeting which adopted it; of whom more than one-third have already passed into the eternal world. The original constitution has been frequently amended, and scarcely a year has passed since its adoption, in which some effort has not been made to change it in some of its provisions.

Filial love for the Alma Mater, and its honored, though too early lamented first President, the Rev. Dr. Rauch, is shown in the resolution of 1842, asking the Board of Trustees of the College permission to contribute to the erection of a monument to his memory. This request having been granted, a definite appropriation was made in 1846, by the Association; and the monument was accordingly erected over the grave of the Christian Philosopher and true Scholar in the humble College cemetery.

Owing to the want of some well digested financial scheme, the pecuniary affairs of the Association early became embarrassed; and this has been a serious cause for complaint to the present time. No doubt, but this has hindered some of the noblest projects originated by the Association, in attempting to carry out the objects aimed at in its formation. But disheartening as such troubles are, they did not in this case prevent the undertaking of some great and important, as well as responsible enterprizes.

First among these, deservedly stands the Review Publication. At the meeting in 1846, H. A. Mish, Esq., offered a preamble and resolutions, which finally led to the origination of the Mercersburg Review. The preamble sets forth: That the philosophy taught in Marshall College, and held to be the truth, by a large majority of all, who have been brought within the circle of its influence, and have investigated its claims without prejudice, is the great feature which distinguishes our Alma Mater from every other American college, and as such should be cherished as the great central interest, the very life and soul of our institution: And whereas, that system is daily misunderstood or wilfully misrepresented, its teachers abused and its believers ridiculed, in publications under the control of opposing interests; while the same publications have ungenereusly, but perhaps prudently refused a hearing of those assailed, it was therefore resolved—

1. That in the opinion of the Alumni of Marshall College, the time has come when the interests of our Institutions and of Truth require an organ, through which the one may be advanced and the other vindicated; and that we accordingly recommend the immediate establishment of a Review, to be conducted by Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D., with such assistance as may be necessary—and devoted mainly to promulgating and defending the views, emphatically ours, known to the world as "Mercersburg Philosophy."

2. That the manifest interest, continually increasing, with which all works emanating from Mercersburg are

regarded by the Literary and Religious world, and the expression of sympathy from different quarters, induce us to believe that such a publication would be welcomed and liberally sustained by the public. As a body, the Association, as well as individually, pledged and engaged to do all in their power to establish and sustain it, by their own aid and all honorable appeals to others.

A committee of five was appointed, who were instructed to proceed with the publication of the proposed Review. The first number appeared in January, 1849. At the first it was issued bi-monthly, but in 1853 it became a regular quarterly, in which form it has continued to appear, to the present time. Without a single dollar of endowment or capital fund, it has been sustained from the beginning and from year to year, alone by its own merits.

Those at all conversant with the history of similar publications need not be surprised to hear, that each year new difficulties stood in the way of the Review enterprize; and the real wonder is that it did not long since fall to the ground. But the same love and devotion to the cause it represents, which first acknowledged its necessity, has hitherto sustained it. Already at the end of the first year of their labors, the Association bore testimony to the zeal of the publication committee, who had in season and out of season endeavored to place the Review on a firm and solid basis. Nor had they been altogether without success attending their fidelity and energy.

When the report of the second year was handed in, the Alumni felt assured that their great enterprize, undertaken in the name of letters, was firmly and surely established. The reputation of the work had reached already from Maine to Texas, and distinguished men in every part of the country had sent in very favorable notices and inquiries for the work. And as high commendations had been given from various quarters, the number of subscribers was felt to be sufficient to support the publication. This was on the supposition that those, who received it with so much favor, would honestly pay for the same. The outstanding

dues already at that time were about equal to the cost of publishing the Review for a whole year. It need not be a matter of surprise, therefore, that the Review soon ran heavily into debt, and ever since has been measurably crippled in its finances. This at times threatened its very existence; and but for the unrequited toil and self-sacrifice of its friends, it must long since have ceased to be. But apart from this gratuity of service, it has never cost any thing but what its own resources have been made to satisfy.

The Review itself is its own best history and commentary. For more than a dozen years it has been before the world, maintaining, during all that time, the high place, it had taken from the first among the best of similar publications in the land. It has already commanded that respect which is due to superior merit. Single-handed and unsupported by the aids, usually necessary in such cases, it stood amid all its opponents, simply strong only in its principle and truth. Opposition, varied and earnest, has not borne it down; and criticism, most keen and unfriendly, has fallen upon it with harmless effect. Its highest meed of praise has invariably come from the highest quarters of authority as to such matters in our land, and its name is cherished and its teaching and principle acknowledged by some of the best minds in the old world.

The influence exerted by the Alumni Association through their Review is only circumscribed by the limits of its circulation. For want of enlarged plans of operations, only, for the most part, to be had by adequate means, the circulation of their favorite publication has not been as extensive as could be desired. All feel, that to have it more useful and better loved, it need only be better known. It was the first living organ of the deepest and most powerful tendencies of the age. It was created by the Mercersburg School of Philosophy and Theology, which was earnestly seeking the solution of the most difficult problem in Protestantism.

In the announcement of the purposes of the Review, we find the following general statements:

"It is devoted to literature, moral science, and religion. On this general field, it refuses to be bound rigidly by any merely denominational or traditional system, and offers room even for the representation of conflicting views. Its librality in this respect, however, is not indifferentism, but is conditioned throughout by an earnest interest in the truth. The Review, accordingly, with all its freedom, has been found thus far to carry with it more unity of character than is commonly exhibited by such publications. It has its governing idea, its animating spirit, its distinctive object and method, as something which all may feel and understand. The line in which it seeks to move, is that of a scientific and truly historical faith, in distinction from the two extremes that threaten its overthrow, the one on the right hand and the other on the left. These are, blind outward authority on the one side, which completes itself in the form of Romanism, and no less blind individual freedom on the other side, whose last sense is reached in Rationalism. Both are *extremes*, in which truth under one aspect is converted into falsehood, by being violently sundered from itself under another. The great problem for the present time is believed to be the reconciliation, practically as well as theoretically, of the two tendencies, which lie at the foundation of this wide-spread abuse. On its successful solution would seem to hang the most precious and solemn interests of the age. The whole cause of Protestantism, in particular, will be found at last to stand or fall with the possibility of shunning its own Scylla here, as well as the Charybdis that roars for its destruction on the opposite side. To the service of this high object, the Mercersburg Review offers itself as an earnest though humble auxiliary. Its motto is: Faith before understanding; but still always, also, *in order to* understanding. It accepts Christianity as a fact in the life of the world since Christ, as well as in the Bible; makes common cause with the consciousness of this new life, as it starts in the Apostles' Creed; acknowledges God in history as well as in nature; and seeks both light and freedom, where alone

they are to be found, in the bosom of that living order which Christ perpetually upholds by the Church. It will always be *Protestant*, of course, in opposition to the corruptions of Rome; but *Catholic* at the same time, in striving to honor and save the glorious and sublime truths, out of which these corruptions, for the most part, spring. In its controversy with Rome, it will allow no companionship, still, with the radical and rationalistic spirit of the age, engaged ostensibly in the same cause."

Later we find also the following, affirming its standpoint to be the Apostles' Creed, the most general confession of the Church in all ages:

"The central fact of this Confession is Jesus Christ, very God and very Man in one person, the substance of supernatural revelation, the true object of saving faith, the principle of sound Theology, as well as the key to all legitimate knowledge in every department of Literature, Science and Philosophy.

As the object of faith and the fundamental principle of knowledge, Jesus Christ abides in the fulness of His grace and power by His Holy Spirit in His mystical body, the kingdom of Heaven, by which alone He can be rightly apprehended, and in and through which He continually carries forward the work of salvation from sin and all its consequences to its complete final triumph over all the powers of darkness.

In the light and strength of these general principles, the Mercersburg Review proposes to continue both as a Review and as an organ for the free discussion of Theological, Scientific and Literary questions, seeking, as far as possible, to adapt itself, in style and in the variety of its contents, to the wants and tastes of different classes of readers.

In opposition to every species of Rationalism and Infidelity, it is Christian; in holding the sublime fundamental truths which are common to the Church under all its forms, it is Catholic; in opposition to all the corruptions of Rome, it is Evangelical and Protestant; and as an exponent of

Anglo-German Theology, and embodying the genius and spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism, it is Reformed.

Occupying this position, it will be a medium for the free expression of various shades of Theological opinion."

The Review has been the main exponent in this country of Germanic life, in Theology and Philosophy, which in some important respects is peculiar in its stand-point and modes of thinking. As such, its most general circulation has been in the Reformed Church, in many respects occupying a peculiar position among the other Churches in America, and whose theological character has been so much misunderstood and misrepresented. In the way of a true Historical Development, it claims a living relation, not only with the Reformation Church, but with the Kingdom of Christ in all ages. History is held to be a living process, the life of the God-man in the Church, as the mystery of the Christian faith; not a mere dead tradition only to be kept safely, but an organic power in full harmony with the constitution of the world. To be historical and churchly, it is conceived, is the only way to apprehend the truth of the world's life.

Having engaged in this interest, its labor was not small, owing to the fact, doubtless, that the position was not only new for the most part in this country, but was also exceedingly unpopular, and at war with all the old systems already at home here. It need not be surprising, therefore, that it stirred up bitter opposition. And under the financial troubles incident to such publication interests, it was almost every year a question whether the Review should be continued. Such motions were always voted down.

In the Spring of 1853, by a legislative act of consolidation, the Alma Mater of the old Association was transferred from Mercersburg and united with Franklin College at Lancaster, under the title of Franklin and Marshall College.

At the following commencement, the Association, through a committee, of whom the Hon. J. W. Killinger was chair-

man, reported a minute in regard to the change. The Alumni Association of Marshall College, deemed that a proper occasion to manifest and express, in a public way, their entire and hearty concurrence in the consolidation, which had taken place between their Alma Mater and Franklin College. And that, in the fond associations which cluster so thickly around the old Institution, and the zealous devotion which we have ever cherished for her genius and spirit, we feel a strong appeal to our feelings as well as to our best judgment, to transfer our love and attachment to the new institution; seeing as we do that the new comprehends and embraces the old, retaining the Mercersburg landmarks in the line of its policy, in its course of instruction and general plan of its Instructors.

It also expressed an unabated regard for Rev. Dr. Nevin as late President and continued confidence in him; and regretted that he could not, in the line of duty, see the way clear for his acceptance of the Presidency of the new college, being well assured that here, as in the old Alma Mater, he would have conferred honor on the institution and given additional value to its testimonials of scholarship.

The name of the Association was so changed as to include the Alumni of the new institution along with those of the old.

At the same meeting, the consolidated Alumni pledged themselves to secure during the year, each at least one new subscriber to the Review, and requested their absent brethren to cöoperate with them in the same matter. It has not been reported how faithfully this pledge has been met. If this action were in any proper and general way, made an actual fact, it is certain, great results would follow in the improved condition of the affairs of their Review.

No project seems to have met with more hearty approval than the endowment of an Alumni Professorship. Year after year the movement was brought up, in different forms, until at the annual meeting in 1857, it was finally determined to found an endowment fund for a Professorship of

Rhetoric, English Language and Literature. The matter was submitted to a committee of whom Dr. W. Maybery was chairman, who made an elaborate report, stating in substance: That as the Association had already determined to act, it was not for the committee to make any inquiry, as to the expediency and feasibility of the undertaking. The work of securing such an endowment will be done only in some length of time. The Alumni are now, it is true, by no means inconsiderable as to numbers nor without influence and respectability; being scattered over many States of the Union, occupying positions of more or less prominence in the learned professions and other walks of life. Yet experience teaches that an undertaking of this nature, and of the magnitude of the one in contemplation, cannot be accomplished at once. The donors and contributors to the nucleus of this endowment fund, ought to have the very best guaranty, that the object will be ultimately accomplished; and that their donations and contributions will be most religiously devoted to that and no other purpose.

The best and surest way then to secure this end, will be to create a fund by soliciting voluntary contributions from the Alumni and others. All donations and interests accruing thereon, to be invested from time to time, in good mortgages or other approved security, until the whole shall amount to *Twenty Thousand Dollars.* When the fund shall have reached that amount then the interest thereof shall be appropriated to the payment of the salary of the incumbent of the Professorship hereby proposed to be endowed; and shall be paid over regularly to the Board of Trustees of Franklin and Marshall College for that purpose.

The aforesaid fund shall be managed by three Trustees in accordance with a Deed of Trust, to be properly executed to them by the Association. In order that such deed may be fully made in proper legal form, the Association resolved to apply for a legal charter, based on the constitution as amended in 1855, which resolve James L. Reynolds, Esq., was requested to have carried into effect. An approved

copy of such a deed of trust was adopted by the Association, and is recorded on the Book of Minutes for the year 1857. A committee was also appointed whose names do not appear on the minutes for that year, but consists, we believe, of Rev. B. Bausman, Rev. Dr. Bomberger, Rev. G. B. Russell, Dr. L. H. Steiner, Rev. John Beck, and Hon. John Cessna, for the purpose of soliciting and receiving contributions for the endowment fund. At the late meeting no report was received from them, so that we have no facts to give further in reference to this noble project. It may be safely inferred, however, that from the known devotion of the faithful sons of our Alma Mater, the endowment will be finally made.

It is a sad thought, that more than one tenth of the old Marshall College Alumni, have already gone to their final reward. There is something truly solemn and warning in this thought. With pious respect for the memory of the departed Alumni, the Association at their meeting in 1859 appointed a committee, consisting of Rev. Prof. T. Appel, Rev. S. H. Reid, Dr. W. Maybery, Dr. Lewis H. Steiner and Rev. Geo. H. Martin, to prepare short biographical sketches, of all the deceased members of the Alumni Association, for preservation in the archives of the society.

With the same fond memory for the lamented first President of their Alma Mater, Rev. Dr. F. A. Rauch, that first prompted them to contribute towards the erection of a suitable monument for his grave at Mercersburg, the Association, after the removal of the College, took early measures to have his remains transferred to Lancaster, along with the College and its reigning system of thought, of which he is in some sense the founder. On the eighth of March in 1859, after appropriate funeral services, his remains were accordingly under the superintendence of the committee appointed, interred in the Lancaster cemetery; the expense being borne by this association. A fund is also to be raised, to erect on the sacred spot, which is now the resting place of his dust, a suitable monument. A full account of the funeral services is to be found in the Mer-

cersburg Review for July 1859. It is to be hoped that the committee appointed in 1858 to attend to the raising of the monument fund will meet with the hearty co-operation from the old pupils of Dr. Rauch. The committee consists of Rev. Dr. J. H. A. Bomberger, M. Kieffer, E. V. Gerhart, Rev. S. H. Reid, Prof. T. Appel, J. S. Reynolds, Esq., Hon. J. Cessna, Hon. J. W. Killinger and Jacob Heyser, Esq.

For some time past the indebtedness of the publication interest of the Association was growing year by year greater, until it became a serious matter to dispose of so as to relieve the society. Several attempts had been made to transfer the Review interests to some one or more who would agree to carry forward the publication and relieve the Association from all pecuniary responsibility. The old plan of having the business transacted by a Publishing Committee, was finally set aside; as the duties had for some time mainly devolved on one man alone, Prof. T. Appel. For several years he had been devoting to the Review no small amount of labor, for which he received no pecuniary return.

By a formal agreement, the whole financial condition of the Review was put into his hands; while Rev. Dr. Gerhart and Rev. Dr. Schaff took charge of the Editorial department. This arrangement continued for two years, till the beginning of 1859, when a change was made, and the contract entered into, by which the Review is at present published. This was in accordance with a resolution of instruction from the Association, and also afterwards ratified at the annual meeting of 1859. By limitation it expires in three years, that is the end of 1861.

According to the terms of this contract, the publisher assumed the entire debt, amounting in round numbers to thirteen hundred dollars; at his own expense also provides annually for the continued quarterly publication of the Review during the term of contract, pays both the Editors a stated yearly salary proportionated to the condition of the subscription list; and on condition of the specified increase

in the circulation, makes the Association joint partner of the net profits. At the end of the contract the increased subscription list, together with the publication, is to be surrendered free from all debt. He receives for these engagements the book accounts for subscription and other assets of the Review concern, and the pledge of the Association for their cöoperation for the increase of the subscription list, and the general success and well being of the Review. This last condition has not, by any means, been so far, complied with. It will be for the Association to determine at their next annual meeting what action shall be taken as to the continuance of the publication. General feeling seems to indicate that, as it has in some sense served its first purpose, some change will be necessary in the future conduct of the Review, in order to make it either to be in the more direct interest of the Alumni; or to become more fully a Church Review for the denomination in which it, for the most part, is supported and circulated.

These two interests, while they are in some measure the same, are yet different. For, while the Alumni are largely in the Reformed Church, under whose auspices the College has been founded and sustained, yet there are even many among these not so directly interested in theological discussions. The Genius and Spirit of the College so peculiar in its Moral Philosophy demanded an organ to expound and defend it. This has been to some good degree done, and the world has felt its power; and many now own its force and truth. It is at work modifying the thoughts and life of others in all stand-points, from the one extreme of ultra montane Romanism to the other of ultra Protestantism. But Moral Philosophy is nearly allied to Theology, and so the points of assault and defence have been, at least to some extent, transferred from the old College standpoint to the higher ground of the department of Theology proper.

Later graduates, especially those of the consolidated institution, have failed as a body to manifest the same interest in the Review, as that shown by its founders, who first

established this organ for the service of truth, as held in their system of philosophy. This is made apparent in the discussions on the subject, which make up a large part of the proceedings of almost every annual meeting,—especially at the last. This matter will most likely be brought directly before the Association at its next annual meeting, when they will be required to act on the future character or discontinuance of the publication. One of two things is most certain; that it must either be considered by the whole Association as their publication, mainly devoted to their interest, and so to be heartily supported; or else it must be given over by that body, to the more direct service of the Reformed Church.

Whether it be seen and acknowledged or not, this much at least is clear; that, if the Review maintains and defends that system of thought peculiar to our institutions, and which constitutes the armour of strength given to the Alumni; and if the Review has contributed and is still helping towards the spread of this power, then every Alumnus owes it as a duty to himself to help that which helps him. By sustaining his Review, he aids thereby the spread of the power which creates his own individual influence and usefulness, and also that of the Association and of his Alma Mater—which is the main object of the Association itself. The Alumni of our institutions are increasing in number and are doubtless, even now with the advantage given them in the peculiar strength of their philosophy, a power in the land. Their Review is not only a power in its sphere, but a recognized authority. It were well, therefore, for each and all to maintain this for the general good.

Perhaps there are no men, as a body, more devoted to any interest than are the Alumni, to their Alma Mater. Persecutions have made her strong, in their rallying around her, with their sheilds of affection and well tried swords of service, a band of noble hearted sons. Year by year they come up from the distant parts of the land, and in common pride rejoice at each annual addition to their number.

Such times, are always too short for their reunions. It was therefore determined, at the last meeting, to memorialize the Board of Trustees of the College, to extend the time of the exercises of the Commencement Week, and defer the graduation day until Thursday; so as to give some adequate time to the Alumni Association, for the transaction of its business with befitting dignity. In connection with this it is also contemplated to hold an annual festival. A committee was appointed some time since to report on this matter. One of the members remarked, while speaking of the necessity of something of this kind, that the simpler the material parts of the festival would be, the better were it for the feast of reason and flow of soul. An occasion is wanted so that the members, long separated by the busy cares of their several arduous callings, may come together in a free old college fashion, a hearty social reunion. This might obviate the complaint sometimes made, that the visiting Alumni have no time to attend and show but little interest in the hurried and confused meetings, where business must be rushed through or neglected. It is to be hoped that this reasonable request will be heard by the Board of Trustees with such favor as to secure this end.

Quite a characteristic move was also made at the late meeting—indeed it may be considered as one of the regular items—that is, to remodel the constitution. A committee was appointed to revise it, without any specific instructions. To the same committee was also assigned the duty of making out a list of the present members, including those in regular standing as well as delinquents. It will doubtless also note the names of the deceased Alumni, and report such graduates as have not become regular members of the Association. Long since, it has been felt that some general regulation ought to be adopted, by which absent members, who cannot attend the annual meetings, may still participate therein by some real act of interest. With some such general view as this, the committee was raised. It consists of Rev. Prof. T. Appel, Rev. Dr. J. H.

A. Bomberger and Wilberforce Nevin, Esq. If distant members have any suggestions to make, the same should be forwarded in good time to some member of the above committee, who would no doubt be glad to be thus aided in the work to which they were appointed.

Next commencement will be the end of the first quarter century in the history of the College. It was deemed befitting to mark it by some proper memorial. At the late meeting the Association resolved to create a committee to confer with similar committees from the literary societies of the College in reference to the preparation and publication of a Quarter Century Catalogue. This memorial catalogue is to contain if possible the names of all who have been students of the Institution, and as far as may be known their several callings or professions and present residences, if still living, and if dead, the date of their demise. If the Diagnothian and Goethean Literary Societies unite in this plan, the Alumni Association will bear one third of the expense of its publication. The catalogue prepared with the above historic features, is to be submitted to the Association at its next annual meeting for revision and adoption, and thereafter to be published, if the contents be approved.

Rightly prepared, this will be a heavy work for the committee, and will require an early beginning if they expect to succeed in any tolerable degree before the next meeting of the Association. But it will at once be seen what an immense historic gain this would be, and an important chapter would thus be prepared for the history of the College. A very large edition might be sold by subscription or otherwise, without entailing any expense upon the Societies thus lending themselves to such a great work. Information and details of facts may be obtained in various ways, especially by engaging the attention of many friends, each one contributing some small items, which though in themselves of little account, yet when properly joined together in the plan proposed, will be of great value. Let the committee go to work industriously, and all will doubtless be astonished at what may be recorded in this simple

way of our Alma Mater and her numerous children. Those who have information on the points here indicated should co-operate with the committee, the chairman of which is Wilberforce Nevin Esq., Lancaster, Pa.

Looking at what has been accomplished and what is already undertaken, and is now about being done, in the name of the Alumni Association, its members and friends have cause for congratulation in the past and present; and, from the brighter hopes luming up from the auspicious future, they may take courage and reap new joys. The College is just entering upon a new era of prosperity and usefulness. And in the success and welfare of their Alma Mater, the Alumni find their guaranty for new triumphs in the cause of truth. The happy memories of old Marshall College will be cherished by true hearted affection, and kept in perennial vigor. And, as the annual increase shall be made from the strong life of Franklin and Marshall College, to the ranks of the Alumni, they with filial love and dutiful zeal, will continue in after years to bring to her the fruits and honors of their lives. Each annual commencement will thus become the celebration of new triumphs, as garlands of trophies shall be brought up, from the distant homes of her sons in all parts of our land, and offered as willing tributes to grace her festal days.

Greater increase of interest is manifest from year to year, in the exercises of the Association and of the College. Time was when it was difficult to get addresses of the right kind for those public occasions, owing doubtless to the lack of attention and befitting audiences. But the case is now vastly different. The trouble will soon be, to find suitable accommodations for the great numbers who are now annually found attending upon these. The annual address before the association for the next anniversary is to be delivered by Wm. H. Miller Esq., of Harrisburg, Pa. The occasion will doubtless be one of general interest, and will draw together a goodly number of Alumni and friends of the Institution at Lancaster. Especially, if the plan for a reunion and festival be matured by that time, it may be made the occasion for inaugurating a new epoch.

Business matters claiming the earnest attention of the Association will also draw, by their importance a very large proportion of the active membership to the next meeting. Reports from the several committees, to whom important items of business were entrusted, will doubtless be given, and action will be required as to their final disposition. Among these it will be remembered are, the revision of the constitution and membership, the act of incorporation, the Rauch monument fund, the endowment fund of the Alumni Professorship, the Quarter Century Catalogue, the continuation of the Review, the annual festival, and the address. Altogether these will perhaps combine more than the usual amount of real interest, and though some of the above mentioned topics have been before the association at previous meetings, as for instance that of the constitution and the Review affairs, yet they now assume new features and require new action.

There have been items of business, which at the time they engaged attention were not without interest, and as such claimed the consideration of the Alumni as a body. But many of these have worn out, by the natural changes of the times; and so claim no place here. Yet all these may be valuable, when a full history is to be written.

Very general, therefore, as requested by the last meeting, this article has been made; perhaps even more so, than the resolution calling for it, contemplated. At different times previously, similar requests had been made for the intended benefit of those Alumni, not present at the annual meetings. And as these resolutions, however, have been hitherto disregarded, this paper had to go over some of the points which should have been previously given. It may also be added, that it was simply impossible from causes outside of ourselves to give it in the October number of the Review. What has here been put upon record, will perhaps prove satisfactory in some measure to many of our absent Alumni, who still feel a warm interest in the general success and transactions of the Association.

G. B. R.

Art. V.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

The Golden Censer; or, Devotions for Young Christians. By Rev. H. Harbaugh, D. D. "And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne."—St. John. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, 1860. pp. 419; 16mo.

Notwithstanding the numerous devotional books which have been published for the use of Christians—all of them more or less adapted to the cultivation of a Christian spirit—it has always been felt in the German Reformed Church that a book of devotions for young Christians was a disideratum. The Liturgy furnished the Church material for public worship, as well as for service at the family altar, but a compilation specially adapted to the uses of the young, full of words of devotion, which should be redolent with the spirit of the Church-fathers, confessors and martyrs, was not to be found. Such a book must be churchly in spirit, and yet thoroughly conservative like the venerable symbol of the Church, for the use of whose children it should be specially prepared. We have gained by waiting, as Dr. Harbaugh has furnished us in the Golden Censer, what we think will seem like an old friend to every one who examines it. And *this* is the true test of a proper devotional guide. Nothing singular or merely novel should be found upon its pages, but all the thoughts, and the language which invests them, should seem like old friends that we had learned to love years ago, and which we would employ in offering up our prayers at the altar.

The Golden Censer consists of meditations, devotional forms, and an order of Scripture-readings for the Church Year. The author has aimed at making just such a work as the young need, and as he himself hath felt the need of at that period of his life. Its scope, however, really includes more than this. It is a Christian's guide from the period when he first learns that he has been dedicated to God, by the solemn rite of bap-

tism, down to that terminus of his earthly career, when his weary spirit prays that he may depart in peace. Our readers will better understand its scope, if we give a general outline of the whole book, which we will do as briefly as possible.

The book commences with prayers for the anniversaries of the days of birth and baptism, and a blank is left in the page for the entry of these dates. This is followed by a beautifully lithographed certificate of Confirmation, to be signed and filled out by the pastor, which, being bound up with the devotional guide of the young Christian, will constantly keep him in remembrance of the solemnities and responsibilities of that rite. Next follow *meditations* for *baptized youth.* The subjects of these meditations, which are short and yet thorough, will show their importance: The Holy Child Jesus, I am baptized, I am in covenant with God, The Washing of Regeneration, The Remission of Sin, The Gift of the Holy Ghost, Burial and Resurrection, Putting on Christ, I am a Member of the Church, I am a Christian, The Beginning not the End, Growth in Grace, The Soul's Longings, The Father's Covenant Love, Remembrance of my Baptism, Hope in the Covenant. These are followed by a series of Meditations on Jesus, as the Teacher, Hope, Guide, and Monitor of Youth, being especially designed for catechumens. Daily devotions for catechumens, with a devout review of baptismal vows and all their meaning, are given preparatory to the part which treats of confirmation. This contains the history of the doctrine and ordinance, with devotions for confirmation day, at home and in the church, both before and after the ceremony.

The second part of the Golden Censer is devoted to "Preparations for the Lord's Supper;" and consists of meditations on its meaning and significance, a private preparatory Liturgy, with prayers to be used before and after communicating. We very much mistake the character of the book, if this part doesn't endear it to many a Christian's heart. The third part consists of prayers before service and after service, furnishing among other forms suitable private devotions in church, which will tend to fix the attention of the worshipper on the solemnity of the house of God.

The fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth parts are devoted to devotional forms for morning and evening prayers and the festival seasons, to special devotional forms and those known

as "*primitive devotional forms,*" together with meditations, prayers, &c., for the sick, and a liturgy for the dying. The ninth part consists of *Thoughts for Young Church Members*, arranged under the following heads: Your Relation to the Church, The Outward Concerns of the Church, Attendance on the Ordinances of the Church, Honoring the Church before the World, The Church of which you are a Member, Your Pastor, Your Relation to your Fellow-members, Proper Conduct in the House of God. These are treated in a plain, practical manner, in the author's happy style of "putting things." The tenth part consists of an order of Scripture Readings adapted to the Church Year. This is much wanted in English. The Order employed by the Anglican Church is adapted to the civil, and not the ecclesiastical year, and hence the Scripture readings are not made to accord, except on Sundays and festival days, with the golden chain of the Church Year. Some difficulties are to be encountered in using an Order adapted to the Church Year in Christmas, New Year and Epiphany weeks, but those are of minor importance, in comparison with the great advantage of regulating our Christian lives and acts by the stated divisions of time, adopted and employed by the Christian Church.

We can cheerfully recommend the Golden Censer to every Christian as an admirable companion to his Bible, Liturgy and Catechism. Pastors will find it a safe book to put in the hands of their parishioners. It contains milk for babes and strong meat for adults.

The general appearance of the book is very creditable to Lindsay & Blakiston. Its form is neat, type clear and paper good. We hope a large circulation may afford some pecuniary reward to the publishers and author, for furnishing us what we do not hesitate to pronounce the best devotional guide for the young we have ever yet examined.

L. H. S.

A New System of Latin Paradigms, with a Synopsis of Declensions, By Cortland Saunders, Associate Principal of Saunders' Institute, Philadelphia. E. H. Butler & Co., Philadelphia. 1860.

Though we know that, of late years, entirely too many grammars have been published, most of which are no improvements on the old, yet when any thing comes out based on the true

philosophical principles, we are constrained to remit our severity on the occasion and regard it with some degree of complacency, as we know, if properly used, it must very much aid the interests of philology and be of essential service to beginners. From all the artificial modes of formation and derivation, some of which are still retained even in our best grammars, happy are we to see that the paradigms of the Latin verb, as set forth, in this little manual, by Mr. Saunders, are wholly free, and that the most logical order is preserved. Thus are they rendered more simple and systematic. By the learner they can be more easily mastered, and on account of the satisfaction which they will give him from their being natural, they will be likely to impress his memory more deeply, and, in fact, never be forgotten. The moods and tenses of the verb are arranged according to their proper times and logical formations; and to the infinitives, in this way, are given their due prominence, as being the principal parts of the verb, from which, in fact, all the others are derived. The *perfect infinitive*, therefore, is exalted to the place so long occupied by the *perfect indicative* in the old system. The supine too, being aroused from its dormant condition, is recognized as an infinitive also, following, however, as we know, only verbs of motion. To beginners we recommend these Paradigms on account of their philosophical simplicity, to whom, when fully comprehended by them, we think they will prove of great service in mastering the Latin Accidence.

W. M. N.

The New American Cyclopaedia: A Popular Dictionary of General Knowledge. Edited by George Ripley and Charles A. Dana. Vol. X. Jerusalem—Macferrin. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1860.

The *New American Cyclopaedia* is now sufficiently advanced to decide its position and merits as one of the most important literary enterprizes of the age and as a truly national work, which every American scholar should have on his shelves along side of other encyclopaedic and lexicographic works for constant reference. It improves with every successive volume. It is a popular, yet by no means superficial universal repertory of human learning, and presents a panoramic view of the present

state of the various sciences and arts with special reference to the wants of America.

It is less thorough and extensive than the *Edinburgh Encyclopaedia* (18 vols.), or the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana* (28 large vols.) or the *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* now in course of publication at Edinburgh, or Ersch and Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyklopaedie der Wissenschaften und Künste,* (commenced in 1831, and embracing thus far 125 vols., with a fair prospect of 50 more) ; but it is more full and satisfactory than Brockhaus's *Conversationslexicon* (15 vols.), and Dr. Lieber's *Encyclopaedia Americana,* which is based upon the former (in 13 vols). It comes nearest in size and general character to Pierer's *Universal-Lexicon der Gegenwart und Vergangenheit* (3rd ed , 17 vols).

Within these limits the *American Cyclopaedia* is remarkable for the combination of fulness and brevity, of accuracy and clearness, for justice and fairness, for the accurate calculation, judicious management, economical and symmetrical distribution of matter and space according to the merits and interest of the respective articles. One of its chief excellences is its unobjectionable moral and religious tone. Its prevailing character is, of course, historical and objective. It honestly endeavors to do justice to all men, parties, sections, and creeds, as every work of the kind should do. The leading biographical, dogmatical and other articles, are generally written by such persons, who from their profession and studies are well qualified to do them justice, who can fully appreciate the subject without being partisans, who can judge of it as close and even admiring, yet disinterested or at least unselfish observers. Many of the ablest and most distinguished pens of America and England have contributed to this work. We would prefer to see the name of each author attached to each article. The sense of personal responsibility to the public would make the writers more careful. The editors understand their business thoroughly and have the advantage of a very extensive literary acquaintance and every possible facility as regards libraries and assistants. Whatever may be the preference of other encyclopaedic works, German, French, or English, there is certainly none which, upon the whole, is so well adapted for American use as the *New American Cyclopaedia* of Messrs. Ripley & Dana.

Professional scholars will, of course, rarely resort to such helps in their own immediate department, and always prefer

going directly to the sources But the extent of human learning is now so enormous, that even the best educated men need such popular repositories where they will find, in convenient alphabetical order, the most necessary information on almost any topic, living or dead, which may challenge their attention.

The work, according to the original plan, was to be kept within 15 volumes, each volume containing between 7 and 800 double columned royal octavo pages, and selling at three dollars. But it is pretty evident from vol. X that the work will run up to 16 or 18 volumes. We understand that the Cyclopaedia, which is sold exclusively by subscription, has already 12,000 subscribers. The liberal and enterprising publishers, whose expenses in this work must be enormous, amply deserve the extensive patronage of the American public.

P. S.

History of Latin Christianity; including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas V. By Henry Hart Milman, D. D, Dean of St. Paul's In eight vols. Vol. 1. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1860.

It is a sad fact that the greatest English historian of ancient Christianity, both Greek and Latin, is the infidel Gibbon, who treats the same not as a new creation far outshining the beauty and glory of the classical civilization and laying the foundation for modern European civilization, but as one of the causes of the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." England has produced many brilliant secular historians since Gibbon, but no ecclesiastical historian who can rank among the British classics. Germany has its Mosheim, its Neander, its Gieseler, and Hase; but England and America must content themselves with translations of these continental writers.

But the literary honor of the English Church is now somewhat retrieved by the appearance of Milman's *Latin Christianity.* He is the first English Protestant historian who, instead of treating the Latin Christianity of the Middle Ages as an object of scorn and aversion, or comparative indifference, restored it to its true and proper position as the centre of mediaeval history, science, art and general progress of society, as the light struggling with the darkness of paganism and barbarism and preparing the way for modern civilization. He has succeeded moreover to make Church history readable, interesting and

fascinating. In beauty and brilliancy of style he excels Hallam, approaches Gibbon and is only surpassed by the unrivalled Macaulay. The English Edition of this elaborate work appeared in 1854, in 6 volumes, and soon passed to a second edition. We have here the first volume of an American reprint, to be completed in 8 volumes. It is from the famous Riverside press of Cambridge, and not only equals, but surpasses the London edition both in beauty and elegance of typography, and in convenience of form. It is really a pleasure to look over these clear, pure and shining pages. The fact that such extensive and costly works, which can hardly look for a large circulation, are reproduced in America in such exquisite dress and offered at nearly one half of the price of the London Edition, is really a high compliment to American enterprize and scholarship.

On the merits of the history of Dean Milman the *Quarterly Review* (vol. xcv p. 39) passes the following highly eulogistic judgment: "No such work has appeared in English ecclesiastical literature, none which combines such breadth of view with such depth of research, such high literary and artistic eminence with such patient and elaborate investigation, such appreciation of the various forms of greatness and goodness with such force of conception and execution, none which exhibits so large an amount of that fearlessness of results which is the necessary condition of impartial judgment and trustworthy statement."

P. S.

The Life of George Washington. By Edward Everett. New York: Sheldon & Co. Boston: Gould & Lincoln 1860.

This new Life of the Father of our country proceeds from the same model press of Cambridge, and is published by the same house of New York, as Milman's Latin Christianity. A work from Mr. Everett needs no further recommendation than its simple announcement. His talents and tastes, it is true, lie more in the direction of general scholarship and elegant rhetoric, than of history proper. Yet for a biography of Washington he has special qualifications from his intimate acquaintance with his subject and his national reputation as the unrivaled eulogist of the character of Washington in the generous service of the Mount Vernon Association. The work was pre-

pared in 1859, at the suggestion of the late Lord Macaulay, for the new edition of the "Encyclopaedia Britannica," and is consequently a comprehensive Memoir for the general reader, rather than a full biography for the particular student. For this could not be condensed into one small volume, as it would imply at the same time a history of the great struggle for national independence and of the infancy of our republican government. We must not look then for anything new in the shape of facts. Indeed it would be difficult, perhaps impossible to add any thing of importance to our information concerning Washington after the exhausting labors of Marshall, Sparks, and Washington Irving. From these national standard works Mr. Everett acknowledges to have mainly derived all his historical material. But his book is by no means a mere compilation on that account. He has fully mastered and digested the labors of his predecessors, and succeeded, in the short space of six months, to present a reliable, fresh, genial and truly patriotic production. May it contribute its share in rekindling the sacred fire of patriotism in these days of sectional irritation and threatening secession.

We learn from the papers that Mr. Everett has consented to prepare a similar popular Memoir of Benjamin Franklin, to be published by the same house.

P. S.

The Vocabulary of Philosophy, mental, moral, and metaphysical. By William Fleming, D. D. American edition, with various additions, by Charles P. Krauth, D. D. Philad'a: Smith, English & Co. 1860.

This book will be a very welcome *vade mecum* for students of philosophy. It is, as far as we know, the only book of the kind in the English language, and meets a decided want. It presents in convenient form for reference a large amount of philosophical information and suggestion, and this to a great extent in the very words of the most distinguished philosophers, who are thus made contributors to the work. It is more than a mere vocabulary, and approaches nearly the character and extent of the *Dictionaire des sciences philosophiques*, or a philosophical Encyclopædia, in alphabetical order. The first edition appeared in London and Glasgow in 1857, and was

soon followed by a second and improved edition. In the American edition our much esteemed friend, Dr. Krauth of Philadelphia, has incorporated an introduction, a chronological history of philosophy down to 1860 (from Tenneman's Manual), a bibliographical index, synthetical tables, and other additions and improvements which greatly add to the value and usefulness of the work.

But even in this improved form it has many defects, some of which we will mention in this connection, as they occur to us on a hasty perusal. In the first place, it should embody biographical sketches of the principal philosophers, and condensed epitomes of their systems. In the second place, it is evidently a one-sidedly English book, and betrays but a superficial knowledge of the continental, especially the later German philosophy since Kant, which has unquestionably done the deepest thinking of the world for the last fifty years. Say what you please of Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and Schleiermacher, they are intellectual giants of the first order, and worthy to be placed along side of Plato and Aristotle. Fleming depends here altogether upon translators and writers mostly hostile to the systems under consideration. The American edition has to some extent supplied this defect in the Appendices. But even here we find much that is defective or entirely erroneous. Eschenmeyer, for instance, did not die in 1822, as stated on page 577, but in 1847, if we mistake not; for in 1835 he wrote a book against Strauss's Life of Christ ("Der Ischariotismus unserer Tage"), and in 1844 a theological tract on the Sin against the Holy Ghost. Michaelis, who is mentioned among the followers of Fichte, had nothing to do with him, and was no philosopher, but an orientalist Fries, who is attached to the school of Jacobi, had a system of his own, of which De Wette was the principal representative in theology. Hegel died in 1831, but why he should be placed in one line with Whately, a philosophical writer still living, and of an altogether different character and tendency, we cannot see. Schelling should have been placed on page 577 before Hegel, who was first his pupil. Rauch died in 1841, and not in 1846. Dr. Schmucker we never saw before enumerated among philosophers. The school of Schelling and Hegel should not be confounded in one, as is the case on page 560. Although Hegel originally proceeded from Schelling, he became the founder of a distinct and world-wide system with a great many distinguished follow-

ers whose names are altogether omitted. His school again is divided into two very different branches, the orthodox and conservative, embracing Daub, Marheineke, Goeschel, Gabler, and to some extent, Rosenkaanz (in his former stage), and the hetorodox, radical and pantheistic, of which the Tübingen historian, Dr. Baur, Dr. Strauss (the author of the "Leben Jesu"), Vischer (the author of a large work on Æsthetics), and Feuerbach, are the most noted representatives. Novalis belongs not to this school, but to the romantic school of poetry, together with the two Schlegels and Tieck, and should be ranked among the Mystics, like Frederic Schlegel, in the following division. In Schelling again his two very distinct periods should have been noticed, the pantheistic, and the theistic, separated by his long silence in Munich. Schleiermacher is neither a "mystic" nor a "dissident" simply from Hegel, but the father of a peculiar school and a theologico-philosophical system which has exerted the most commanding and widespread influence. Herbart, too, has a system of his own. Some of the most distinguished living philosophers of Germany, as Fisher of Erlangen, Weisse of Leipsic, Fichte, jun., of Tübingen, Ulrici of Halle, and Trendelenburg of Berlin, should have been mentioned in the list, the more so as they ably and zealously endeavor to reunite philosophic speculation with the Christian revelation, and to verify the principle of Bacon: *philosophia obiter libata abducit a Deo, penitus hausta reducit ad eundem.* The list of German emperors ceased with Francis II, and since that time there are only Austrian emperors, whom we would be very sorry to see at the head of all Germany. The kings of Prussia are much more deserving of that eminence, to which the Frankfurt Parliament wished to elevate them in 1849. These, and similar errors and defects, however, might be corrected and supplied by the able and industrious American editor in some future edition. The book will, no doubt, find a wide circulation, and is well deserving of it

P. S.

Old and New. By the Rev. Dr. James Craik. New York: Daniel Dana, Jr. pp. 283.

What is true is not new, and what is new is not true. In falling back upon the Truth, as revealed of old, the author aims mainly to show the innovations of Romanism to be false; and at

the same time gives a passing notice to the more modern sects. The argument is to show, that the Protestant Episcopal Church has in keeping the old truth; that Romanism, so far as it is distinctly Romanism, is of later growth, therefore untrue; and that the same false principle has fructified from time to time in later and very various forms of untruth.

The result as made out by the book is, that the great majority of Christians of *all names* do really hold fast the truths which God has revealed as essential to salvation; and that man may not say what proportion of human error will be sufficient to take away the saving power of the truth with which it is mingled. That is, the Catholic Church is made up of two factors, the divine and the human. While the divine is ever the same, the human may exist in various degrees of developed grace. Hence, the hurtful contests and animosities that distract Christians are only the outgrowth of their own human opposing and inconsistent devices, while they are one in essential truth.

God has given men a religion, and has also furnished them sufficient evidence by which to distinguish His truth from human variations and corruptions of it. Men are sacramentally to be made members of the Divine family, receiving thereby the pledge of God's grace, and the sign and token of His blessings.

Dr. Craik makes a good argument against the chief Romish Sophism, that any corruption of religion by the Church, of any age or period, is absolutely inconsistent with the being of the Church. So that if any corruption is proved upon the Church, the Church must be considered *ipso facto* at an end, and the promise of Christ, to be with her, to have failed. This of course, as directed against the imperfections of Protestantism, makes you accept all the assurd teachings of Romanism, claiming to be the Catholic Church, on the principle, that either you must be content to be without a Church of God in the world, or you must take as Divine truth every miserable corruption and conceit which may be foisted upon religion by an ignorant and degenerate age. If true, it would hold against Romanism as well as against branches of Protestantism.

Objective truth is absolute, but this comes subjectively to be realized under various circumstances. Under all these, the essential truth is always the same, though the varied impres-

sions under which it is apprehended are as many as the independent minds upon which its impressions are made. So truth subjectively considered is always in some degree imperfect. The truth held in unrighteousness is yet not destroyed. Falsehood, idolatry, and apostacy prevailed at times universally, but the Church was not destroyed. So it was in the old Jewish economy, and the Church of the Middle Ages. Reformation of these abuses, does not make a new system. The Church remains always, as Christ promised. The argument is historical, without the idea of development, necessary to make history.

This is Dr. Craik's weakness in his argument, and in so far he fails to make the discussion conclusive. The Creed itself is a development; so also in a certain sense are all the old formulas of truth. The branch of the Catholic Church, of which the author is himself so excellent a representative, is itself also a development as compared with the Apostolic Church. For while the Church of all ages has had the whole truth, as for that age, sufficient to judge of any man's teaching of it, even of an inspired Apostle; yet the form of sound words, in its subjective apprehension, is developed into fuller equivalents of the same truth. Thus logic sometimes becomes weak. To insist on the truth of the Old as opposed to the falsehood of the New, may require a rigid logic to reject the truth that the man was once a boy, or the full grown oak an acorn or shrub. But truth is life, and is so revealed to men.

The very distinction made between objective and subjective truth, implies the condition necessary for form and contents, as divine principle and human, living manifestation of it. But there are besides this, many valuable thoughts in the book. It will do much good, as showing, that the Revelation of God is itself made to us under the form of life, in history, incident, prophecy and sacraments, then fully in His Son, and kept by the Church for the salvation of men. While Truth is old, it is at the same time also perennially new. The problem for us is to rightly distinguish between the false and true. Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, to-day and forever.

R.

Lectures on the Early History of Christianity in England, with Sermons. By Rev. Dr. T. W. Coit. New York: Daniel Dana, jr. pp. 334.

In these Lectures Dr. Coit engages to show that Christianity in Britain is derived from the East, and not from Rome. The ancient British type of Christianity he considers as old as that of Italy itself. The Christian Britons were driven, by the invasion of the Pagan Saxons, into Wales and Cornwall. And the mission of Gregory the first, at the close of the sixth century, was not the principal means of converting the Pagans of the British Isles, and was not at all necessary for converting them. These Lectures on the Early History of Christianity in England make up about half the volume. The remainder contains nine sermons preached on different occasions. The third of the series discusses the History of the Soul: its origin, nature, and destiny. The fifth is on God's uses of Evil Beings. The last is on the Standard of Appeal on doubtful points, where the Bible fails to produce Unity.

Why the Lectures were joined with the Sermons, especially as they are unfinished, is not very apparent; except it may be to make a respectable looking volume, which in the hands of Mr. Dana, the publisher, has been done. But while it does that, it destroys the unity of design in the book itself. The contents together are however interesting and valuable.

R

The Domestic Altar—A Manual of Family Prayers, adapted to the various seasons of the Ecclesiastical Year, with prayers and thanksgivings for special occasions. By Rev. H. Croswell, D. D. New York: Daniel Dana, Jr. pp. 261.

Also, Devotions for the Family and the Closet, from the Manual of a Country Clergyman. New York: Daniel Dana, Jr. pp. 115.

These are excellent books for the use of families, where the head of the household has to resort to forms in conducting daily family worship. The language of the prayers is natural, simple, scriptural and liturgical. The first of these volumes is the fullest collection, and contains the most varied forms for the Church Year. As far as we have examined these they seem to be well appointed.

The other book is perhaps more convenient, in having only eight prayers for morning and eight prayers for evening worship, besides fourteen prayers for special occasions and eighteen private prayers. It has also a portion of Scripture assigned for the morning service—and a selection from the Psalms is prefixed to each evening prayer.

We notice, however, that in the Prayer for Monday evening the Holy Ghost is called "*it*" and "*its*," which is doubtless an oversight, as the author does not design to ignore the *personality* of the Third person in the Holy Trinity.

R.

The Catacombs of Rome: as illustrating the Church of the First Three Centuries. By the Rt. Rev. W. Ingraham Kipp, D. D. Daniel Dana, Jr. New York. pp. 212.

The main point of this interesting book seems to be a defence of the primitive truth of Christianity, as against the pretensions of Romanism. It appeals to the records of the tombs of the early Christians, to show the reigning spirit, the faith and works of those who belonged to the early Church, in the days of persecution.

The argument is good, as far as it is made to meet the more modern inventions in the faith and practice the of Romish Church. But to our mind, it is not conclusive, when he makes the illustrations and inscriptions taken from the tombs of the early Christians at Rome, help to establish the three orders of the ministry. Undoubtedly those early Christians at Rome knew of Deacons, Presbyters and Bishops, as did also the New Testament saints. As so we might expect to find reference made on the tombs of those who had been such in the Church before they died. But the question is only begged, when it is assumed, that the New Testament Deacons and those of the early Roman Church, were of the same order as those in the Protestant Episcopal Church: and that the Elder or Presbyter and Bishop were different grades of office.

R

Bibliothecae Probata. A catalogue of Books selected, examined and arranged under the heads of Bibles, Prayer Books, Commentaries, Devotional Library, Family Library, Parish Library, Sunday School Library, Academic and

School District Library, with full descriptive titles, characterization and prices. To which is appended a list for the Library of a Parish Minister—drawn with much care and consultation of learned authorities. New York: Daniel Dana, Jr. pp. 231.

This we take to be a valuable guide to those who are about to buy books. As we cannot study all books before we buy them, it is important to consult some reliable authority, so that we may avoid the many worthless and bad books published. Mr. Dana keeps none but standard and the better class of works; mainly, however, so far as they are denominational, in the interest of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

R.

Charles Challen & Sons, Publishers, Philadelphia, are issuing series of publications adapted to the wants of Sunday Schools, and children generally. Song Without Words, Home Life, The Arab, The Jew, The Young Cottager, etc., making up the series, entitled *Juvenile Library*, are pervaded by a healthful moral and religious tone. Some of the volumes are decidedly Christian. We can commend them to the confidence of parents and Sunday School Teachers.

E. V. G.

A Collection of Hymns: supplementary to the Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Watts, by W. C. Dana. New York. Daniel Dana, Jr.

This collection contains many sacred gems not found in the common books. There are hymns found relating to the following order of subjects: God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, Seasons of Worship, the Scriptures, Man's Natural State, the Gospel, Conversion, Faith, Love, Patience, Desire, Constancy, Obedience, Charity, Affection, Joy, Peace, Consolation, The Church and Ordinances, Missions, Special Occasions, Death, Judgment, Heaven, Doxologies. The whole together number about five hundred, and from this rich store the weary spirit may find supplies. Doubtless many have learned that the more the thirsty soul drinks from such fountains, the fresher and sweeter are the streams.

R.

THE TYPES OF GENESIS briefly considered, as relating to the development of Human Nature in the world within, and without, and in the Dispensations. By Andrew Jukes. London: Longman, Brown, Green & Co. pp 407.

This remarkable book on the mystic character of the Scripture and other kindred matters, deserves a more extended notice than we can here give. It was first our intention to give it a full review, but not being able to do so then, it was handed to a friend, who promised to notice it. After two or three readings, however, he returned it, with the remark, that the more he read it the less willing was he to review it.

The preface to the book had best be read after you are through with the book itself. The introduction is on the work and rest of God. Then follows seven types in human nature. First, is of Adam, or Human Nature. From this is begotten Cain and Abel, or the carnal and the spiritual mind. Next is the Regeneration of the human, as in Noah, passing through the waters of Baptism. From this new order comes, in due time, Abraham or the spirit of faith. This faith begets then long after, the spirit of sonship, as in Isaac. Sonship again begets obedient service, as Isaac begets Jacob, who lays hold with his hand. From the spirit of service arises another type in Joseph, who finally represents suffering and glory. The whole is beautifully grouped together.

Whatever there may be in the book overdrawn, there is certainly much in it that is well drawn, and it becomes exceedingly suggestive of thought. Those who have gone through any of these several types experimentally, will understand the author, just as far as they come, he says, and he expects nothing more.

R.

COMMENTARY ON ECCLESIASTES, WITH OTHER TREATISES. By E. W. Hengstenberg, D. D., Prof. of Theol., Berlin. Translated from the German by D. W. Simon. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., No. 23 N. Sixth street. 1860.

Dr. Hengstenberg stands confessedly at the head of the orthodox school of modern commentators and critics of the Old Testatment Scriptures. His principal and most valuable works—on the Messianic prophecies, on the Psalms, on the genuineness of the Pentateuch and the prophecies of Daniel—all relate

to the Hebrew canon, and defend the orthodox views against rationalistic innovations, yet with a full mastery over the various advantages of modern philology and criticism, and with occasional modifications and adaptations of the older views to the present state of knowledge. Thus in this commentary on Ecclesiastes, he gives up the tradition of Solomon's authorship which was first called in question by Grotius on philological grounds, the style being that of a much later age. Hengstenberg assigns the composition of the work to the period of the Persian dominion, the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, and labors to prove that the title, "The words of Koheleth, the Son of David, the King in Jerusalem," (ch. 1, 1), are no argument for the old view of the church which regarded the work as the fruit of Solomon's repentance, but that the name of Solomon is used here merely in an ideal sense as the representative of Wisdom.

Whatever may be thought of this question of authorship, the commentary of Hengstenberg is scholarly, instructive and edifying.

Besides the Commentary, the stately and handsome volume before us contains translations of several valuable theological Essays of Hengstenberg, which appeared first in his "Evangelical Church Gazette," namely on the Book of Job, the Prophet Isaiah, the Sacrifices of Holy Scripture, and the Relation of the Jews to the Christian Church. The translation runs smooth and easy; but we had no time to compare it with the original, to justify a definite opinion as to its merits.

P. S.

The Benefit of Christ's Death. Originally written in Italian by Aonio Paleario, and now reprinted from an ancient translation. With an Introduction by Rev. John Ayer, M. A. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860.

This curious little book once helped to spread evangelical opinions in Italy at the time of the Reformation, and may now serve a similar purpose in the political commotion of that interesting country. It was written in 1543 in Italian by Paleario, a distinguished scholar and professor at Siena, who joined the Protestant movement, fell into the hands of the Roman Inquisition, and, after more than three years' imprisonment, was sentenced

to death for heresy. All the copies of his Book which could be found were destroyed.

But two or three copies of an English translation (made not directly from the Italian, but from a French version) which appeared first in 1577, and passed through at least four editions, were recently discovered in England. From this translation the present edition is a faithful reprint, with the exception of the spelling and punctuation which have been modernized. The tract has also been republished in German and Italian. (A German edition was reprinted even in this country, at Marthasville, Mo.)

The tract is a fresh and vigorous exhibition of the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, and shows what a powerful effect this doctrine exerted in the sixteenth century over the minds of some of the most serious and learned men even in Italy.

P. S.

Sinai and Zion, a Pilgrimage through the Desert to the Land of Promise, by Rev. Benjamin Bausman, is a new duodecimo that is just published by the enterprizing house of Lindsay & Blakiston, Philadelphia. Through the kindness of the publishers, several advance sheets have come to hand, which we have read with great pleasure. Judging from these, we feel justified in announcing a work of more than ordinary freshness and interest on the Land towards which the eyes of all men are turned. Solemn and dignified, yet free and unaffected, it sets before us places and scenes, manners and customs, in beautiful outline; and gives us, at every turn, striking illustrations of the allusions, local, social and historical, with which the Sacred Scriptures abound.

E. V. G.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1861.

Art. I.—JESUS AND THE RESURRECTION.

"O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken," the Saviour said to his two disciples as they walked on their way to Emmaus, and were sad (Luke 24: 13–33.): "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?"

The "*ought not*" here may be referred to both clauses of the proposition, so as to mean that it was necessary for Christ to die and to enter into his glory, in order that he might by his glorification carry out in full the great purpose for which he had come into the world. Properly, however, the necessity in question is affirmed of the first part of the proposition in order to the second. Christ must pass out of the world through suffering and death as the only way in which he could enter into his glory.

Why was this order necessary? Why must the Redeemer of the world die, to fulfil his heavenly mission?

It may be answered, that the truth of the old Testament Scriptures required it. In no other way could they be fulfilled. The disciples are charged with folly, in not having understood and considered this. And so, we are told, "beginning at Moses, and all the prophets he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (v. 27); as afterwards again in the midst of the eleven, we hear him declaring (v. 44), "These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me."

Whereupon it is added, "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations."

But this answer, it is easy to see, does not carry us at all to the inward reason of the fact which it serves to authenticate as right and true. God's revelation must of course be in harmony with itself from beginning to end. The plan of salvation foreshadowed in prophecies and types must agree with the plan of salvation fulfilled finally in Christ. But this only brings back upon us with new emphasis and force the question before proposed: Why was it necessary that the Saviour should have his mission to fulfil in this way? Why were the Scriptures so framed from the beginning as to converge throughout in this strange sense, that Christ must suffer and die in order that he might enter into his glory?

The answer may be again, that in no other way could he make satisfaction for the sins of men, and thus open the way for their being restored to the favor of God. It was necessary that sin should be atoned for by the penalty of death; the whole Gospel centres in the idea of sacrifice; without the shedding of his blood Christ could not be a true Saviour for sinners. Therefore "he bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins should live unto righteousness." By his death he became "the propitiation for the sins of the whole world." The *blood* of Jesus Christ the Son of God, we are told, "cleanseth us from all sin."

In all this there is unutterably precious truth. But still it does not of itself at once conduct us to the last sense of our question. Suffering and death abstractly considered have no force, in and of themselves, to atone for sin. We can easily conceive of the sufferings of Christ himself being so circumstanced, that they would have been of no efficacy whatever for this end. If he had suffered, for ex-

ample, in some other nature and in some other world than our own, the sacrifice must have been for us of no account. Or what is yet more to the purpose, if he had in our nature suffered and died in such way as to have continued afterwards under the power of death, it is plain that all the sorrows of Gethsemane and Calvary would have been powerless to take away a single sin. We cannot say therefore of this relation of Christ's death to the "call for blood" which is supposed to lie in the idea of God's offended justice, that it forms of itself the final cause or absolutely last reason of the law, which made it necessary for him to die in order that he might be a perfect Saviour. His death made atonement for sin; just as it was an exemplification also of the highest moral truth for the saving benefit of men through all time; but neither of these purposes can be said to have exhausted its intention or bounded the full scope of its action. They were both comprehended in a necessity of religion broader and deeper than themselves; and with reference to this it is that the question still returns upon us with more solemnity than ever: *Why* did it behoove Christ —having undertaken the redemption of the world—to suffer and to pass out of the world by death, in order that he might accomplish his mediatorial office and work?

The full proper answer lies in the form of the Saviour's interrogation itself, as already explained. "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter"—that is, so as to enter, or in order that he might enter—"into his glory." It was necessary that he should die, since only in that way could he reach the glorious consummation of his mediatorial office, and become thus qualified in full to impart life and immortality to the world.

The nature of this necessity will appear, if we reflect upon the constitution of the Redeemer's person in its relation to the present world.

Christianity roots itself in the mystery of the incarnation. By the power of that great fact it started originally, in the person of Christ, within the bosom of our present natural human life. To redeem man, the Word became flesh,

clothing itself with our nature in the most real way. It did so because the idea of redemption required more than any merely outward foreign help. The help must incorporate itself with the life of humanity itself, so as to work by this and through this for the accomplishment of its ultimate object. Such was the meaning of Christ's person, as he stood among men in the days of his flesh. He was the wisdom and power of God unto salvation, in human form. The fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily.

But the very same mystery which makes sure to us the real humanity of Christ, assures us also of the continual presence in his person of a life higher and far more powerful than that of our common manhood in its present natural form—a life supernatural and divine—in virtue of which alone it was possible for him to fulfil his mediatorial work, so as to become the author of salvation for the world. The incarnation means nothing except as it is taken to involve throughout the fact of this higher nature in Christ, and to require at the same time the full unfolding of its resources and powers in connection with his proper humanity, as the only way in which we can conceive of any such revelation as being true and complete. It lay thus in the very constitution of the Redeemer's person that its more than simply human attributes, qualities, and powers —what belonged to it as the eternal Word tabernacling in flesh—should come to suitable development and manifestation. Only so could he display the full perfection of his own being; only so could he take possession of his kingdom and glory; and only so could he be completely qualified as the prince of life, to save his people from their sins, and to bring them up finally from the power of the grave.

For all this, however, there was no room, no sufficient theatre and platform we may say, in the existing economy of the present world. The conditions and limitations of our life as it holds here in the order of nature are such, that it was not possible for the full power and glory of Christ's person, and so for the full sense and purpose of his mission into the world, to come out and make themselves

known under any such form. The impossibility was both physical and moral.

Regarded simply in its *natural* constitution, it was not possible that the world as it now stands could be a sufficient theatre for the manifestation of the kingdom and glory of Christ. It belongs to the very conception of nature, that it should exist in the form only of continual revolution and change. The fashion of the present world, in this view, is always passing away. It subsists by a perpetual process of coming and going. To this law of vanity man himself in his present life, forms no exception. As comprehended in the general constitution of nature, though including in himself at the same time the principle of a wholly different superior order of life, he is subject so far as this lower relation prevails to the same conditions of change that characterize the system everywhere else. His physical being here is in no sense commensurate with his moral or spiritual being; and nothing is more plain, than that this last needs and demands for its ultimate full development some different mode of existence altogether—a mode of existence in which while the physical shall remain, it will be no longer as the physical merely holding in its own order, as in the present world, but as the life of nature sublimated and transfigured into the life of spirit. In such view the present world, the mortal condition into which men enter here by birth only to pass out of it again by death, could never as such become the seat of a truly perfect and glorified humanity; and it was not possible, therefore, that the kingdom of God as it revealed itself in Christ, for the accomplishment of man's redemption in this form, could ever actualize itself in full on any such theatre or in any such sphere. It might begin here, nay, it was necessary that it should thus come in the flesh in order to be a true redemption for men born of the flesh—but it could not keep itself throughout to such unequal bounds; it must find room for itself by going beyond them, and unfolding a new order of existence answerable to its own nature.

There is represented to be thus, in the Scriptures, a con-

stitutional incompatibility between the present world, naturally considered, and the kingdom of God. The very idea of this kingdom involves attributes, which suppose and imply the passing away of much that is essential to the notion of the world as it now stands.

But the difficulty here is not simply physical, a want of full congruity between the conception of nature and the law of life in Christ Jesus; it meets us still farther under a moral aspect, and only in that view indeed comes out at last in its whole significance and force. That man should be subject to the general vanity of nature, and need to be supernaturally redeemed from it, notwithstanding his own spiritual constitution, in virtue of which it ought to be ancillary only to the objects of his higher life, is a fact which in and of itself convicts him of having fallen from righteousness into sin. His present life, being so related to the economy of nature around him, is not normal. His subjection to such vanity is plainly a penal curse. Death with him is the wages of sin; and his whole present mortal state, accordingly, running as it does continually toward this end, and having for itself no other possible issue or outlet, is comprehended in the terrible force of this law from beginning to end. How then should it be possible for him to be redeemed in full in his present mortal state? How should he be made superior to the curse of his fallen life, in the very circumstances and conditions which show the power of the fall itself, as it rests upon him in the present world from the cradle to the grave?

The case in this view is put by the Bible in the strongest light, when the present world itself, as a whole, is represented as having by reason of man's sin, fallen in some way under the actual dominion of Satan, so as to be now through his bad auspices positively hostile to all righteousness and truth. He is denominated the "prince of this world," the "prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." He is the "god of this world who blinds the eyes of them that believe not"—through the objects, relations and interests of

the present world of course—"lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." This way of representing the subject is too general, and too explicit, to allow of its being resolved into mere metaphor. Most clearly the Scriptures see in the world, as it now stands, an organized power of sin, over which Satan presides, with the purpose of defeating if possible all God's thoughts of mercy toward our fallen race. When Christ came into the world, it was to do battle with this prince of darkness and his kingdom in the most real way. So much was signified by his personal conflict with the Devil in the wilderness, immediately after his baptism; a conflict which served to foreshadow the meaning of his whole subsequent ministry, and which came finally to its last scene only when he could say: "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out; and I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me"—signifying, we are told, what death he should die. In conformity with which, his incarnation is said in another place to have been for this purpose, "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

It lay thus in the very idea of man's redemption, that it could not be completed in the form, and under the conditions of his present worldly life; for that would imply, that it might co-exist with the curse from which it seeks to set him free, and be in fact part of the very same constitution of things that has grown out of the curse, and which is pervaded and ruled throughout by the law of sin and death. If our human life was to be redeemed at all, it must be by its being "delivered from this present evil world" (Gal. 1 : 4); and such deliverance to be real must be in the form of a victory, surmounting the whole order of the world as it now stands, and revealing itself as a force greater than nature, greater than sin and all the consequences of sin, under another and altogether different mode of existence.

While it was necessary then that the Son of God, having undertaken the work of man's redemption, should for this purpose become man, and so make himself subject to the curse of his present fallen state, it was full as much necessary that he should not continue in the sphere of the curse —the constitution of man's life as it holds in the present world—but that he should break through this sphere, by exhausting and conquering the whole power of the curse, so as to make room for his kingdom and glory under a higher form. And being fully qualified for all this in the constitution of his person, through the union of the divine nature with his humanity, it was not possible that his incarnation, in its relations to the present world, could take any other course. His manifestation in the flesh here was necessarily a circumscription of his proper mediatorial life and power, an obumbration or hiding of his essential mediatorial glory, which in the nature of the case could not be permanent, but must be regarded as a temporary economy or process simply through which, in the fulness of time, the full mystery of his higher nature would break triumphantly into view. "It was not possible," we are told, "that he should be holden of the pains of death"—that the grave should be able to retain him in its power. But this may be said with equal force of his whole subjection to the power of the present world—the power of nature, including in it now the curse of sin and the inevitable issue of death. That which made it impossible for him to be holden of death, made it impossible for him also to be holden of the mortal constitution through which the natural life of man in the present world is penally shut up from the beginning always to this dread conclusion. Being in himself the principle of righteousness and life, he could not stay in the region of mortal vanity, he could not remain imprisoned in the sphere of the curse; he must burst all these bars, break through all these limitations, in order that the "powers of the world to come," which were all along inclosed in his person, might be able to unfold themselves in a way commensurate with their own glorious nature.

As the bearer of our fallen humanity, it was necessary thus for Christ, in order that he might enter into his glory, not simply to pass out of this world, but so to pass out of it that he should at the same time bear its curse. The law of sin and death, the power of Satan which prevails in the world through this law, must be met and surmounted in its own sphere, to make room for the law of life as a superior force in another sphere. The moral limitations of man's present state must be overcome in the way of righteousness, as well as its physical limitations in the way of power. In other words the Redeemer must exhaust the curse by entering into it and taking the full weight of it upon his own soul. He must suffer in order that he might be glorified. He must die in order that he might destroy, not only death, but him that had the power of death, and so bring life and immortality to light through the gospel.

This is the idea of the atonement; an idea which centres indeed, of course, in the passion and death of the Saviour, but yet never in these apprehended under an isolated separate view—as though the death of Christ *per se*, and without reference to anything farther, were sufficient at once to take away sin in the character of a legal payment in full to God's offended justice. The power of Christ's death to take away sin, its atoning and saving efficacy, is *always* conditioned in the New Testament by the fact of his resurrection, the victorious superiority of the law of life in him as thus asserted over the law of sin and death. Without the resurrectien the death could be of no account. It is his victory over the grave that gives significance to all his sufferings, and imparts to his blood the whole virtue by which it has become the propitiation for the sins of the world.

To fulfil his mission at all then as the Redeemer of our fallen race it was in every way needful that Christ should suffer and die, so as to rise again, and take possession of his kingdom in its proper, eternally glorious form. The problem of redemption itself required it; and it was made

necessary also by the constitution of his own person. It would have been a grand contradiction, to pretend to set up and complete his kingdom in this world. The eye of the Saviour himself, accordingly, was steadily directed through the whole course of his ministry toward what he saw to be the necessary end of it in his violent death. His disciples indeed, to the very last, clung to the expectation that he would still assert his Messianic glory, agreeably to the common notion among the Jews, under an outward temporal form in the present world. But this was in the face always of their Master's own most plain and solemn words, affirming just the contrary; and when their understanding was properly opened for the purpose after his resurrection, they could see easily enough that it was against the true sense also of the old Testament scriptures, as well as at war wholly with every right view of Christ's person and work. For the salvation of the world, we may say all depended on the glorification of Christ; and this was conditioned absolutely, not simply by his coming in the flesh, but by his suffering in the flesh, and passing out of the world by death. The incarnation must complete its own necessary historical movement in the person of the blessed Redeemer himself, by his being made to suffer the contradiction of sinners, and the furious assaults of hell, out to the extremity of death itself, and by his rising again from the dead, and ascending to the right hand of God—all power being given unto him in heaven and in earth—before it could become fully available, fully prevalent rather, for the purposes of salvation in general, through the mission of the Holy Ghost as it began to take place on the day of Pentecost. "The Holy Ghost," it is said in one place, "was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." So he continually speaks of his own removal from the world, as being not merely the signal, but the cause, for such a spread and triumph of his kingdom as could have place in no other way. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die," we hear him saying with reference to this very thought, "it abideth alone; but if it

die, it bringeth forth much fruit." Again: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." The entire gospel, with all its opportunities and powers of salvation, depended on Christ's glorification.

The "glory" into which Christ entered by his sufferings and death was in one view the same, which he had with the Father before the world was (John 17: 5). But in another view it was a new state or condition, resulting from his union with humanity and the work of redemption. It was the glory of his mediatorial life advanced to its full perfection, in the form of victory over the powers of darkness and evil in the world. It was the glorification of the man Christ Jesus, made perfect through suffering, and exalted at last to the free unobstructed use of the prerogatives and powers which belonged to him as the Son of God. This was the end and object of his humiliation from the beginning. He became a man, and made himself subject to the curse of humanity in its present fallen state, that he migh roll away the curse, and in his human nature itself become head over all things to his church. Because he humbled himself, we are told, God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name (Phil. 2: 8, 9). For the joy that was set before him in this form, he endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of God (Heb. 12: 2). He descended first into the lower parts of the earth, that he might ascend up afterwards far above all heavens, leading captivity captive, and so have power to confer all heavenly gifts upon men (Eph. 4: 8–10).

The relation of this mediatorial glory of Christ, then to his previous state of humiliation in the present world, was not one simply of local difference—the humiliation belonging to one world and the glory a waiting fact in another—making it necessary for him to pass from the first over to the second that he might possess the fact as his own; as strangers, for example, may find it necessary to cross

mountains or seas, in order to come to their proper homes. The relation was one at the same time of real cause and effect. The humiliation of the Redeemer, by its victorious issue, created and brought to pass his mediatorial glory—his condition of perfected humanity in virtue of which only he is the author and finisher of salvation for men; just as the seed, to use his own image, which is cast into the ground and dies there, through that very process of decomposition, is not simply metamorphosed afterwards into another form of life, but actually produces and calls into being what it thus dies to reach. Only as sin, and death, and hell were first conquered in his person; only as the principle of life which was in him became the actual presence of the resurrection, bringing the whole order of the world under his feet, and making room for his glory as a fact brought to pass in this way of victory and conquest; only as the powers of that higher life in the Spirit were first triumphantly asserted in the mediatorial glorification of Christ himself, was it possible for any such state or condition of glory, any such reign or kingdom of salvation, to have real being at all for our fallen race. Thus literally must we take his own words: "I am the resurrection and the life." Because he lives, his people live. Their life is hid with him in God, so that when he appeareth they shall appear with him in glory. As he is the first-born of the natural creation, by whom all things were created that are in heaven and that are in earth, so is he also the beginning, the first-born from the dead, in whom is comprehended the whole power of the new spiritual creation, in virtue of which all his saints are to be raised up to life and immortality at the last day (Col. 1: 16–18).

All this being so, well might the risen Redeemer say: "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" In no other way could the work of redemption become complete. In no other way could the mystery of the incarnation show itself to be true. The only order of faith here, as distinguished from all humanitarian fancies and from all Gnostic dreams, is that of the

ancient Christian Creeds. Starting with the supernatural conception and birth of the Saviour, it goes on immediately to confess his passion, his death, his descent to hades; only to proclaim, however as the necessary result of this the glorious fact of his rising again from the dead, his ascension to the right hand of God, the consequent sending of the Holy Ghost, the establishment thus of the Church, and the economy of grace within its bosom, from its one baptism for the remission of sins onward and forward to the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting.

The subject leads us to some general reflections on the nature of Christianity in its relations to the present world.

I. The Christian salvation, by its very conception, is a supernatural fact which must in the end transcend the constitution of the world as it now stands altogether, going out of it and beyond it, and finding room and opportunity for its full development only in a new and higher mode of existence.

This in one view seems to be so plain a truth as necessarily of itself to command universal acknowledgment; since all men do in fact pass out of the present world by death, and if saved at all therefore can be saved in full only on the other side of death and the grave. But the proposition now before us means a great deal more than this. What it affirms is a constitutional difference between the kingdom of Christ and the present world, making it impossible for them to cohere permanently in one system, and requiring the last absolutely to pass away in order to make room for the first. This is not at once plain for the general thinking of men; and there has always been a tendency in the human mind accordingly, to reduce the difference in question to one of mere measure and degree, to make it more outward than inward, more relative than absolute, so as to invest the idea of the kingdom of God after all with something of a mundane character, carrying out more or less the order of our present natural life.

Such, we know, had come to be the reigning opinion among the Jews, when our Saviour made his appearance in

the world. They looked for a Messiah who should rule as a temporal prince, restoring the throne of David, and extending his empire under a worldly form throughout the whole earth.

The same expectation was fondly cherished by the disciples of Christ, and exerted an active influence over them, even after they had come to apprehend in some measure the spiritual glory of his person, notwithstanding all the pains he himself took to eradicate every such thought from their minds. "We trusted it had been he," they say sorrowfully after his death, "which should have redeemed Israel." And even when fully assured subsequently of his resurrection, they were not able at once to take in the full sense of that transcendent fact, but are heard still asking: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel" (Acts 1; 6). It needed the baptism of the day of Pentecost to liberate them completely from this Jewish preconception, and to reveal to them the true nature of the kingdom of heaven, as being an economy based upon the resurrection of Christ, which must therefore necessarily transcend along with this fact the entire constitution of the present world.

In different ages of the Church, the expectation of the millennium, and of Christ's personal reign upon the earth, has not unfrequently assumed a form involving virtually again the same old Jewish error.

There is however another more subtle, and more common, mode of overlooking the difference, which holds between the constitution of nature and the constitution of grace. It consists in regarding the kingdom of heaven as the continuation and carrying out in some way of the right order of the present world; so that if it may not be actualized here in full, there may be at least a near approximation to it through a proper use of the powers and possibilities of our general life this side the grave. Christianity, it is assumed, must be in harmony with the relations and needs of man's nature in his present worldly state; and what these show to be his obligation and calling here—

physically, intellectually, socially, morally—that must be considered as fitting him also for his proper destination hereafter, and as forming, therefore, a direct preparation at least for the kingdom of heaven in the world to come. Such is the humanitarian evangel, which in one form or another has come to prevail so widely especially in our own time, thrusting itself into the place of the true gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. According to this the measure and criterion of Christianity are to be found in its supposed suitableness to the earthly interests of men in their present earthly state; and the prosperous furtherance of these interests, accordingly, is held to be the onward march of the gospel itself, advancing steadily to its millennial glory, and anticipating the full idea of the kingdom of heaven. The order of nature is regarded thus as a system or process, which completes itself by its own movement in the order of grace. "From nature up to nature's God," is made to be the watchword of religion in place of that grand announcement: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." To bring matter into subjection to mind through science and art—to verify the sense of the eighth psalm, as far as possible, in a merely natural way, instead of reaching after its verification in the way signified in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews—is held to be for man the great problem of his life, the first law of his ethical being, in fulfilling which he cannot fail to be true at the same time to the claims and behests of religion. Material interests readily transmute themselves thus into spiritual interests. Gain becomes godliness. The triumphs of political economy, the successes of agriculture and trade, pass themselves off for the triumphs and successes of Christianity. Knowledge affects to be, not only power, but piety also and faith. The idea of freedom and the rights of man puts itself forward as synonymous with the idea of redemption. The civilization of the world challenges acknowledgment and regard, as being in truth the evangelical salvation of the world.

But how different now from all these terrestial schemes and conceptions, is the representation of Christianity and the kingdom of heaven with which we are met, when we look into the New Testament? My kingdom, Christ says, is not of this world. The way to it for himself lay through the world, and out of it, into another order of existence altogether; and how could it be for his people then any new disposition simply of the mortal *seculum* in which they have their being this side the grave, or any continuation merely of its laws and forces over into the world beyond. There can be but one law here for Christ and his followers; the disciple must be as his Master. If it was necessary for Christ to conquer and transcend the whole constitution of the world as it now stands, in the way of death, that he might enter into his glory, it must be no less necessary for Christians, if they are to have part in this glory, to pass out of the world in the same way. So much indeed is comprehended in the fundamental rule of Christianity: "Deny thyself, take up thy cross, and *follow me;* as well as in the pregnant aphorism: "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." The kingdom of heaven is no mere continuation or carrying forward of the order of this life, whether physical or ethical; it is constitutionally different from this; and is to be reached and possessed only as the whole system of things seen and temporal is superseded at last, through death and the resurrection, by things unseen and eternal.

II. Hence the true significance of the doctrine of the resurrection, and its momentous importance in the Christian system.

The gospel begins in the birth of Christ only to complete itself in his resurrection. Without Easter, Christmas can never be more than an Ebionitic lie or a Gnostic dream. The higher life which joined itself with our dying humanity in the person of Christ, to authenticate itself as real and true, must return again with this humanity to its original sphere. He that descended must also ascend—far above all heavens—up where he was before (Eph. 4: 10.

John 6 : 62). "I came forth from the Father," we hear him saying, "and am come into the world ; again I leave the world, and go to the Father" (John 16 : 28). Being what he was from the beginning, the Word incarnate, the only begotten of the Father tabernacling in flesh, it was not possible that his life could hold itself to the bounds of our present earthly state—still less that it could remain shut up under the natural conclusion of that state in the grave and in the dark world of Sheol or Hades ; it must rise from the dead, and in doing so burst the cerements at the same time of this whole mortal economy, showing death and sin to be conquered forces, and asserting its own original superiority in a new order of existence altogether. This is what we mean by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead ; and it is easy to see, how in this view it forms the grand argument or proof of his mission, and becomes for all genuine faith the keystone which binds together the universal arch of Christian doctrine. It is no outward seal simply—the attestation of a stupendous miracle—ratifying and confirming the Messiahship of the Saviour; it is the necessary end and completion of the idea itself which entered into the constitution of his person, without which this must be at once convicted of fantastic unreality. Without it he would have been an impostor, even if he had not pledged his truth previously on the fact. It was the only way in which he could be demonstrated effectually to be the Son of God (Rom. 1 : 4). Being put to death in the flesh, he must be quickened in the spirit (1 Peter 3 : 18). Manifested in the flesh, he must be justified in the spirit, that is, vindicated and shown to be divine through the power of the higher life which was in him, surmounting the law of death, and advancing him to heavenly glory, through the resurrection (1 Tim. 3 : 16).

The resurrection of Christ, being thus the natural result and necessary issue of his heavenly life in its union with the mortal life of men in this world, it could not be a return simply to the condition in which he was previously to his death, the mere recovery of what had been transient-

ly lost by that change. The restoration of Lazarus from the grave was nothing more than this ; it served merely to re-instate him in his old life. But it was not for Christ to be brought back from the dead in any such way as that. With the view that is sometimes taken of his death, indeed, as including in itself the whole power of the gospel in the light of a purely outward price paid for sin, and complete for this purpose by itself alone, a resurrection of this mundane sort, bringing after it the setting up of Christ's kingdom in the present world, might seem to involve no fatal contradiction ; and it is easy to see also that it would fall in happily enough with much of the humanitarian thinking of the present day, if only we were allowed to conceive of the Saviour's victory over the grave in this way. But every such conception turns the mystery of the incarnation into a figment at last, just as really as if it were pretended that his death was followed by no resurrection whatever. He rose from the dead in virtue of what he was *more* than all that belonged to humanity beyond his own person ; and his resurrection, therefore, was not only a return to what he was as a man before, but a free unfolding at the same time of the living power which was previously veiled under his earthly state—but which made itself known now in the way of victory over the universal order of the natural world, abolishing death, and bringing life and immortality to light.

And what the resurrection of Christ is for the doctrine of his person, that in the view of the New Testament the resurrection of believers is also for the doctrine of their future salvation. They are saved through the power of a new heavenly birth—the birth of the Spirit in contradistinction to the birth of the flesh—a birth from above, made possible by the coming down of the Divine Logos into the sphere of our present fallen life—in virtue of which, they are made through union with him to be partakers of the Divine nature, to be the children of God, so as to have in them even here the principle of an indestructible life, which shall be found to triumph hereafter over death itself, in

bringing up their bodies from the grave, and causing them to be fashioned into the likeness of the glorious body of Christ himself. The idea of the Christian redemption is never that of a salvation which consists in the mere perfecting of the order of man's present life (Ebionitic humanitarianism); nor yet that of a salvation which has to do with his soul only, magically transferred to some other state (Gnostic spiritualism); it looks always to a deliverance that shall make him as a part of the present world superior to its constitutional curse, carrying him victoriously through it, and crowning him at last with immortality in his whole person, body as well as soul. The doctrine of the future state for the righteous becomes thus the doctrine of the resurrection. How full the New Testament is of this thought everywhere, it is not necessary to say.

No one can attentively consider, however, the stress which is laid by the sacred writers on this whole topic, the resurrection of Christ and as flowing from that the resurrection of believers, without being made painfully sensible of a serious aberration from this evangelical peculiarity in much of what claims to be the most evangelical style of religious thinking at the present time.

In the Acts of the Apostles, it is remarkable how the whole idea of preaching with St. Peter first and afterwards with St. Paul, seems to revolve continually around the same theme. On all occasions it is the great fact of Christ's resurrection from the dead which is insisted upon, not as a proof merely that the Gospel in some other form is entitled to credit, but as being in reality the sum and substance of the Gospel itself—the whole power of which stands in the consequent glorification of Christ, and the mission of the Holy Ghost making it effectual for the salvation of men through the Church.—Not only at Athens, but in all places, it might be said of Paul emphatically, that he "preached Jesus and the resurrection." So in all the New Testament Epistles. The burden of their teaching throughout is Christ crucified and raised again from the dead, the hope and power of a

like resurrection in due course of time for all his people. Let it suffice for the present to quote that trumpet toned passage, Eph. 1 : 17–23, as an epitome of the universal gospel in *their* sense. "The God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him. The eyes of your ununderstanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe; according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places—far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church—which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

Who will say that either the resurrection of Christ, or the resurrection of believers, is made to be of the same central interest in the Protestant Christian teaching generally of the present time? With a large part of our pulpits the theme rarely comes into full view at all; and when it does receive attention it is too often in such a way as virtually to kill it by making no account of its proper relations and connections. The truth is, the evangelical theory which rules very much of what is now regarded as Christian teaching would seem to be essentially complete in its own way, both christologically and soteriologically, without either the resurrection of Christ or the resurrection of believers.

III. The system of agencies and powers by which the kingdom of heaven is upheld and carried forward in the present world, in its course of preparation for the world to come, is supernatural, and can be properly apprehended only by the power of faith.

It is not magical—an economy of unearthly forces playing over into the world in a ghost-like visionary way. As

the manifestation of Christ himself in the flesh was real, and not simply apparitional as pretended by the Gnostics, so is the constitution of grace also proceeding from his person and work, in its relations to those who are still in the flesh, an earthly constitution. It belongs to the present world, and reveals itself historically under worldly forms and relations. With all this, however, it is a constitution which derives its whole being and force from the resurrection and glorification of Christ. It is brought to pass, and made to be of effect, not through any power that is comprehended in the natural organization of the world, but only through that higher power in Christ's person, in virtue of which he transcended at last the entire constitution of nature, and became head over all things to the church in another order of existence. The very conception of the church, in this view, is that of a spiritual organization in the world, proceeding from the resurrection life of Christ, which while it is in the world is yet not of the world, but the result and presence always of powers and forces which in relation to it are supernatural.

The kingdom of Christ among men is something widely different thus from any other moral or spiritual dominion. Take for example, the authority of Aristotle, which ruled the world of mind through so many centuries. It stands forth as a grand fact in human history, worthy of more admiration than the outward empire of Alexander. But who thinks of ascribing to it, for this reason, any superhuman character. The kingdom of Aristotle was after all part and parcel only of the world's natural life, as it culminates in human intelligence—a true and genuine product, historically, of the powers of humanity in its present mundane state, just as much as the victories of Alexander or the wars of Julius Cesar. But we have no right to conceive of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, under its earthly character, in the same way. It is *not* the product of any forces that are comprehended in the natural constitution of the world; and by no such powers can it be maintained, or carried forward, in the exercise of its legitimate functions,

to its heaven appointed end. It starts from the glorification of Christ; it is the form and manner in which the glorified Christ reveals his presence, and puts forth his power, in the world for purposes and ends that lie beyond the world altogether in his own state and condition of glory. How is it possible then to conceive of it all, if it be not considered a supernatural constitution, carrying in itself supernatural resources, fulfilling supernatural offices, and bringing to pass supernatural results?

Thus it is that the Church is made to be an article of *faith*—one of the primary fundamantal articles—in the Creed. Faith in the Church, however, cannot stop with its abstract conception. It must extend to its agencies and powers, its modes and means of grace generally. These may not be estimated by any merely natural standard. We are bound to own in them a supernatural efficacy and force. The word of God is quick and powerful, in a way that transcends all human rhetoric or logic. The sense of the sacraments is not to be plumbed and sounded by any mere natural reason; baptism is supernaturally more than the washing of water, and the Lord's Supper is supernaturally more than the eating of bread and the drinking of wine. The ministry of reconciliation, as it comes by commission from the risen Saviour, and forms part of his ascension gift, includes in it also some portion of his resurrection authority and ascension power. Ecclesiastical acts are not of one order simply with civil acts—they bind and loose, we are told, in heaven. These are hard "sayings," we know, for the common thinking of the world; but it is not easy to see how they can be successfully gainsaid, if we are to admit at all the idea of a constitution of grace on earth, differing from the constitution of nature, and flowing from the glorification of the Saviour regarded as an abiding fact. To make the Church of one order after all with the powers and possibilities of the present world, is to turn the resurrection of Jesus Christ into a Gnostic myth.

J. W. N.

Art. II.—THE EARLY INTRODUCTION OF CATECHIZATION IN THE REFORMED CHURCH.

John Christopher Koecher, a little more than a century ago, wrote a Catechetical History of the Reformed Church, down to his time. About the beginning of the present century Henry Van Alpen published "The History and Literature of the Heidelberg Catechism," in which is included much catechetical history relating to the Reformed Church. Down to 1750 he depends chiefly on Koecher, but from other sources he ably brings the history down to the beginning of the present century. There is also much valuable matter pertaining to this subject contained in Max Goebel's History of the Christian Life in the Rhine-Westphalian Evangelical Churches, Coblenz, 1849. These works are all in German. There is also considerable of valuable catechetical history contained in the Introductions to many of the older commentaries on the Heidelberg Catechism. Drawing freely, in some parts almost literally translating from these sources, we have arranged, combined, and from various less important sources filled out and complemented, a sketch of the introduction of catechization in all the Provincial Reformed Churches.

As the Reformed Church of Switzerland produced the first Reformed Catechism, so to it belongs also the honor of taking the lead in introducing the catechetical system into the Reformed Church generally. Soon after the Reformation the Swiss began, not only to instruct in this way the youth, but also those of an advanced age who were found ignorant of the fundamentals of the Christian religion; and for the attainment of this end they introduced the most excellent catechetical arrangements. The French Reformed followed the example of the Swiss; and soon Germany, especially the Palatinate, became alive to this interest.

As early as 1527, it was ordained in St. Gall that, instead of the Sabbath Vesper, the Catechism should be explained every Sunday afternoon at three o'clock. At the Synod of Bern, 1532, the following decision was made in relation to catechization: "The youth shall be taught to love and fear God through Jesus Christ; and this shall be done not only by bringing before them passages of Scripture, but the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, on which already several little books have been written, shall be explained to them." So also the following year the civil government of Bern came to the assistance of the ministry, and published an ordinance that the pastors and teachers, on every Sunday and holy-day in the afternoon shall instruct the children in the doctrines and duties of Christianity, exhorting them to discharge the duties of their office, having in view that they shall one day answer to God. This ordinance was renewed in 1536, when it was also made the duty of parents, without fail, to send their children to catechetical instruction from their seventh to their fourteenth year.

In the same year the first confession of faith of the Swiss Church was prepared at Basel, in which, among other directions given to the ministers, the duty of giving catechetical instruction was expressly included. Among other things on this subject it is said: Of old the Lord enjoined upon his people, to exercise the greatest care in the instruction of the young from their tenderest years, and in His law He has expressly commanded that they shall be taught, and that the mysteries of religion shall be unfolded to them. We know from the Gospels and apostolical epistles that God in the new covenant manifests no less concern for the youth, since He has expressly said: Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God; therefore those pastors act most wisely who early and diligently catechise the youth, early lay the foundation of the faith in their minds, teaching them the first principles of our religion, explaining to them the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the design of the Sacraments, besides the other principal matters per-

taining to religion. The Church will show its faithfulness and diligence in holding the children closely to the Catechism, and will desire to have its children instructed, and rejoice when this is faithfully done.

As early as about the year 1544 instruction in the Catechism every Saturday was introduced in Zurich by Otto Werdmüller, and later it was also held on every fourth Sunday. It was held in the church of Zurich, and also in the country, and was largely attended by the people of all ages and stations. John Conrad Ulmer, pastor in Schafhausen at this time, also did much for the cause of catechization. He required the scholars to repeat the questions publicly in the convent church; with the consent of his associates he also made arrangements according to which the Catechism was explained every Sunday in the afternoon sermon.

Ludwig Lavater describes to us the manner in which catechetical instruction was carried forward in Switzerland: Every Saturday afternoon at three o'clock the catechist takes the children from all the schools—the Latin and the German—into the principal church, where he instructs them in the main points of religion; the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and the Sacraments. When they have somewhat progressed in the Catechism he requires the children, a list of whose names he has from the teachers, publicly in the church before a large assembly of people, to repeat what he has explained to them, and practices them in answering the questions, and at the same time exhorts them in regard to what they have learned.

The Swiss delegates to the Synod of Dort related the following in reference to catechetical instruction in their country. "On Sunday in towns there is more than one sermon delivered, of which one is catechetical. The Catechism is gone over once every year, in order that by means of repetition it may be more deeply impressed on the mind. All those who have either been dismissed from the schools or who cannot attend, such as male and female servants,

are required to attend the Sunday catechetical sermons. On Saturday evening of each week a catechetical sermon is delivered, which is for the benefit of pupils of both sexes. In these sermons the catechist sometimes presents merely principal points in religion, as the Ten Commandments, the Christian Creed, and the Lord's Prayer; and at other times he explains the questions in the Catechism. Both he does in simple and comprehensive language; and on certain Sundays he examines publicly as well what attention has been paid by the hearers, as the progress and growth of the children in religious knowledge. In cases where a minister has to preach in two or even three villages, he alternates in his Sunday catechetical sermons. In several places where the people on account of the distance are not able to attend both Sunday sermons, only one, and that a short one, is delivered; and when that is ended, the congregations remaining together, the Pastor assembles those who teach the Catechism, examines them by questions, and tells them what further to teach. Nor does he merely look with all diligence after the youth, but also cares for persons of all ages, whence it also occurs that aged persons also derive not a little benefit from these instructions. Registers are also kept in which are recorded not only the names of the persons attending, but their age and their progress in the knowledge of the truth is also indicated. The industry which some manifest is stimulated by public praise, and at times also by little rewards; and the tardiness of others is met partly by reproofs and partly also by civil interferences. In towns as well as in the country there are schools in which the young are not only instructed in reading and writing but especially also in the Catechism, in praying, and singing. When the cold in the churches seems to be injurious to children, the catechetical sermons are held on Sunday in the houses. In those places where catechization has just been introduced, in order the better to bring the peasantry to obedience, the fathers and mothers, as also some that are grown up, have been excused, and only young people, by way of commence-

ment, have been instructed in the Catechism, until in time something more general can be accomplished. In order that the desire to learn may be the more awakened and sustained, all those who desire to enter the state of matrimony, are required to appear before the pastor, and sustain an examination as to their knowledge in the matters of religion. It is then left to the pastor to grant their request, or to defer their marriage a certain time, in which they may be able to make up for any deficiency which could not exist without injury to their faith and morals. No young persons are admitted to the holy communion till they have been examined, and it is found that they understand this holy mystery. So also no one is permitted to be sponsor at a baptism, if he has not before given satisfactory evidence that he possesses the necessary knowledge of this mystery and knows the duties of a sponsor. Finally, it belongs to the official duty of pastors diligently to visit the schools, and by their presence as well to stimulate the industry of the teachers, as also to encourage and quicken the love of knowledge in the youth."

Hottinger, who wrote the catechetical history of his fatherland at length, says: "In our time catechetical instruction is much honored and practiced in our Swiss churches. It is carried forward in a three or fourfold way. Such as are yet very ignorant are required first to learn several very easy dialogues concerning the doctrines of the Christian faith, which are called the small questions. Then follows the small Catechism, which consists only of the principal explanations of catechetical truths; and after this comes the large Catechism, yet only the language in it is learned. Lastly the whole course of catechetical instruction is concluded by an analysis of this large Catechism, with the confirmation of each point by proof texts from the holy Scriptures.

In a country where such zeal for the catechetical system prevailed the excellences of the Heidelberg Catechism could not be long unknown. It was in fact held in the highest esteem from the first; and though other Catechisms, as we have seen, had been in use, and the work of catechizing

bound up by these, yet it was soon partially introduced, and gaining prominence more and more over others it soon became "invested with a kind of universal authority, as a bond of religious profession for the land in general."* Bullinger, the friend and successor of Zwingle, praised it with the greatest enthusiasm, and in 1565, at the request of Frederick III. wrote a defence of it in reply to attacks made on it by its enemies. This served to make it known, and called attention to its merits in Switzerland. The Swiss divines saw with pleasure that the tone of its teachings accorded with the spirit of the views of religious truth which had been current among them, and the laity were charmed with its practical and devotional spirit. In St. Gall, says Van Alpen, it was introduced into schools and churches. The best evidence that its authority was prevailing over all others is found in the fact that the Catechism of Zurich was reconstructed and improved with a view of making it conform to the Heidelberg Catechism. At the great Synod of Dort, 1618–1619 the deputies from the Swiss Reformed cantons adopted it as a symbolical book. Various editions of it appeared at St. Gall, Zurich, Basel, and Berne, and many learned men wrote explanations of it. Gradually it was brought into practice or exclusive use throughout all the Reformed cantons, and continues to enjoy that honor to the present day.

Catechetical instruction was introduced into France from the example of Switzerland, and was practiced in the French Reformed Church with great zeal and diligence. From the year 1563 forward during an entire century the matter was before every synodical assembly where counsel was held in regard to arrangements and improvements, and many ordinances passed in regard to catechization. At the Synod of Lyons, 1563, the question was raised, whether the children under ten years of age should be permitted to answer the catechetical questions. The conclusion on this point was, that each consistory be left to decide this

* History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism. By Dr. Nevin. p. 87.

matter for itself. The Synod of St. Foi, 1578, reminded all churches of their duty diligently to hold catechization, and exhorted the pastors and church officers thoroughly to explain and teach the catechism by simple and easy questions and answers, in which they should accommodate themselves to the capacity and ignorance of the people, and not to indulge in any discussions of theological doctrines. Those churches in which catechetical instructions were not diligently carried on, were exhorted to introduce them and to observe them strictly.

At the Synod of Vitre 1583, the question was discussed whether Calvin's catechism should be continued in use, or whether a smaller one, consisting merely of the Apostles Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, should be taken as the guide in these instructions. In the year 1594, at the Synod of Montalban, it was ordained that the catechism of Calvin should be adhered to, and that no Pastor or teacher should be allowed to use any other; the general catechetical instructions, however, which are held regularly before the celebration of the Lord's Supper, should without exceptions serve for the instruction of all the people according to the regulations on this point which each church should find most convenient and profitable to this end. The Synod of Salmor, 1596, of Montpellier 1568, and of Gap 1603, confirmed the use of Calvin's catechism, without the least change, deprecating all innovations in regard to this point. The Assembly, or Synod of the French Reformed ministers which was again held in Vitre 1617, enjoined the diligent use of the catechism in the churches, but left the mode of explanation by questions and answers to the freedom of the consistories, as being best acquainted with the capacities of the children. At the Synod of Alais 1620, and of Charenton 1623, the observance of the twelvth —according to the new edition of the Book of church discipline the thirteenth—canon was most strictly enjoined. It runs thus: "The churches are instructed to make very frequent use of the catechism, and the ministers are enjoined, by simple, definite, and plain questions and answers

to unfold and explain it—to adapt themselves to the ignorance and rudeness of the people without indulging in lengthy discussions on common points. This distinctly is the duty of the ministers, to catechize, each in his own congregation."

At the Synod of Charenton, 1644, a resolution was passed that on Sunday in the large churches, sermons should be preached on the catechism and the matter therein contained as also on other theological points; but this should not in the least be allowed to set aside the ordinance concerning the catechetical instruction in questions and answers; and in case it should not be possible to instruct the children in the catechism every Sunday, special days in the week should be selected and consecrated to this holy service. For the better instruction of adults special catechizations should be held several days previous to the celebration of the holy communion. It was made the duty of the provincial Synods to see to it that this practice be most strictly observed in all the churches under their care, in regard to which they were to be called to account before the national Synod. This wholesome regulation was approved, re-enjoined and confirmed at the Synods of Loudun, 1659 and 1660—directing additionally that in those churches in which two services were held on Sunday, the second sermon should be devoted to the explanation of the catechism; that in the towns and churches were more than one sermon was preached each day of the week, one or two of these sermons should be explanatory of the catechism; and finally that in the very large churches which are divided into different sections a special teacher or catechist should be appointed for each division of the town or country, or at least a suitable Elder should be selected and placed over each of those sub-divisions of the congregation to catechise the young. So zealously did the Reformed Church of France provide for the catechetical instruction of the young. No wonder that a people so early and so carefully indoctrinated were so firm and constant in their adherence to their faith, ready for the flames or for banishment—to both which trials they were afterwards subjected, and in which

they acquitted themselves heroically, mantaining their faith with a true martyr courage, and crowning their memory with a true martyr glory.

The churches of the Netherlands, as early as 1568, at the Synod of Wesel ordained that the Heidelberg Catechism should be used in churches and schools, in the instruction of the young. This however, was felt to be inadequate. The churches complained and asked for something more efficient and direct; and the experience of the ministers also taught them that something more was needed. Accordingly at the 14th Session of the celebrated Synod of Dort the matter was brought up and discussed during several subsequent sessions. It was decided that a more familiar and particular instruction by questions and answers, as required by the true mode of catehising, was needed; and it was accordingly enjoined.

As in itself interesting, and as directly bearing upon the early introduction of catechization in the Reformed churches of Holland, we here present the reader with a translation of the action and Resolution of the National Synod at Dort in regard to a more particular catechization of old and young, passed in the seventeenth Session November 30th 1618.

The form of the Synodical resolution concerning a more particular catechization of old and young, as drawn out of, and constructed from, the written recommendations, as well of the foreign as domestic churches, which had been handed in, is as follows:

In order that the Christian youth, from their earliest and tenderest years forward, may be diligently instructed in the fundamentals of the true religion, and imbued with true piety, three ways of catechization must be observed: *In the families, by the parents: in the schools, by the schoolmasters: and in the Churches, by the ministers, elders, and readers or visitors of the sick.* To the end that all these may faithfully perform the duties of their office, the Christian authorities are entreated to further a work so necessary and holy by their authority. All those also to whom is

committed the oversight and visitation of the churches and schools shall be exhorted to exercise special care in regard to this point.

It is the office of parents, earnestly and industriously to instruct their children and all belonging to the household, at home, in the rudiments of the Christian religion, according to the capacity of each; earnestly and zealously to exhort them to the fear of God and sincere piety, and to accustom them to the practice of family prayers. They shall take them along to church that they may hear the word of God; they shall with them afterward diligently repeat the sermon, and especially the catechetical sermon, read several chapters of the holy Scriptures, cause them to commit to memory the most prominent passages of the sacred Scriptures; they shall explain the same in a plain manner suited to the capacities of tender youth and seek to impress them upon their hearts, and thus to prepare them for catechization in the schools; and when they begin to receive instruction in the school to encourage, confirm, and labor to advance them according to their ability. The parents shall be earnestly exhorted to the performance of this duty publicly by the ministers, and also privately, as well at the ordinary visitations before the celebration of the Lord's Supper, as at other suitable times by the ministers, elders, and deacons. Since some parents who confess the Christian Reformed religion are found neglecting this holy work they shall be brought to their duties by solemn reproof from the minister, and if the case requires it, by the censures of the consistory.

Schools, in which the growing youth are suitably instructed in piety and the first principles of Christian doctrine shall be established, not only in towns but also in all the villages, where hitherto none have existed. The Christian authorities shall be requested everywhere to provide the school-masters with adequate salaries, in order that men of suitable qualifications may be secured, and they may be encouraged to give proper diligence to this work. But especially that the children of the poor may be in-

structed gratis, and not to be excluded from the benefits of the schools.

In the service of these schools no one shall be employed unless he is a member of the Reformed church, has testimonials of the correctness of his faith and the piety of his life, and is well exercised in the teachings of the catechism. He shall also subscribe his name to the confession and acknowledge the catechism of the Netherlands, and by a holy vow engage that he will according to this order earnestly catechize and instruct the youth entrusted to him in the fundamentals of the Christian religion.

It shall be the duty of these school-masters, to practice all their scholars, at least two days in each week, according to their age and understanding, not only in committing the catechism to memory, but also in endeavoring to make them understand its principal parts. To this end three forms and modes of the catechism, adapted to three conditions of the young, shall be used and pursued.

The first shall be for the children : comprehending the Articles of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Institution of the Sacraments, the part pertaining to church discipline, together with some short prayers, and simple questions based on the three parts of the Catechism ; to this may be added some of the most prominent passages of the holy Scripture for edification in godliness.

The second shall be a brief synopsis of the Palatinate* Catechism, which is used in our churches. In this the instruction of those who have made a beginning in the other mode shall be carried forward. These two formularies shall be according to the example of the Palatinate churches, or the church of Middleburg, or after the manner prescribed by this Synod.

The third shall be the use of the Palatinate Catechism, adopted by our churches, in which those shall be instructed who are farther advanced in knowledge and years. The French churches in the Netherlands which have hitherto used the Genevean Catechism may retain it in those

* The Heidelberg Catechism was then so called.

churches and schools. But no other formula shall be used by the school-masters, in the schools. The authorities shall be entreated by their supervision to exclude all papal Catechisms, and other books containing error and impurity from the schools. The school-masters shall exercise care that the scholars not only commit these formularies to memory but that they also pretty well understand the teachings therein contained. To this end they shall plainly explain the same in a way suited to each one's capacity, diligently and often question them and repeat the explanations, to see whether they have comprehended the true sense. The school-masters, each and all, shall bring the scholars entrusted to them, to hear the holy sermon, and especially the catechetical sermons, and diligently examine them in regard to the substance of them.

In order that the diligence of the school-masters and the improvement of the scholars may be known, it shall be the duty of the minister with an elder, and if it is necessary, with several of the magistrates, frequently to visit the schools, to encourage the school master, show him how to catechize, by their example, publicly and privately instruct and impress the youth, in a friendly way, stimulate them, by asking them questions, and by praise and small rewards for diligence, together with exhortations to piety, incite them, in the presence of the magistrate, to new diligence and godliness.

The school-masters, since some of them are found negligent or stubborn shall be earnestly exhorted by the ministers in regard to the duties of their office, and if it is necessary by the consistory. In case they do not heed such exhortations, resort shall be had to the magistrates, that by their intervention they may be induced to attend to their duty, otherwise others shall be appointed to fill their place.

Finally the magistrate shall be requested to tolerate no schools in which these holy exercises in catechization are not allowed, or are avoided.

It shall be the duty of ministers to preach public catechetical sermons in the church. These shall be short, and

as far as possible so constructed, as to suit not only the adults but also the youth. Also the industry of those ministers shall be praised who employ time and opportunities to repeat these in the schools, especially in the country, not shunning the labor necessary in so good a work. In this way those who are more advanced in years, and have not enjoyed the advantages of the schools at all, or not in a sufficient degree, may be better instructed in the fundamentals of the Christian religion. For experience teaches, that the customary instructions given in the churches, as well the catechetical as others, are not adequate in the case of many, to implant in them the knowledge of the Christian religion, which ought among the people of God to prevail. The custom proves that the living voice has very great power when questions and answers are used, simple and adapted to the capacity of those to be instructed, which is the best mode of catechizing, and in this way the elements of religion are impressed upon the heart. Hence it shall belong to the office of the minister, with an elder, to visit all such as desire to learn, and either in houses or in the consistorial room, or in some other suitable place to collect together once a week, such members of the church and others, examining and instructing them in the principal parts of the Christian religion, and as opportunity shall allow to catechize them according to their capacity, progress, and ability to comprehend the truth. On such occasions the catechetical sermons shall be repeated, and all diligence shall be used that each one may come to a clear and full acquaintance with the catechism. Those who shall then desire to unite with the congregation, shall be diligently and frequently instructed in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in a certain place, during three weeks before, that in this way they may be enabled more correctly and fully to give an account of their faith.

The ministers shall be careful to invite for instruction such in whom they may see visible hope and fruit, and whom they know to be troubled in regard to the salvation of their souls. These ought then to be brought together and examined,

particularly such as are of the same understanding, that they may freely speak with one another and be mutually awakened. These meetings shall be commenced and concluded with prayer and solemn exhortations.

All this, so far as it is undertaken and observed, with delight in the work, with watchfulness, care, faithfulness, zeal and discretion as it should be by ministers who expect one day to give an account of the flock which has been entrusted to them, cannot fail in a short time, by the blessing of God, to bring forth the most abundant fruit, which shall be seen by all men as well in the progress of the faith as in holiness of life, to the honor of God and the advancement of the Christian religion in general, working favor and increase in our churches.

So far the action in regard to catechizing taken by the celebrated Synod of Dort. Subsequently particular Synods showed great care to carry out these doctrines. The subject was earnestly discussed, and action in regard to it was taken by the Synod of North Holland at Edam, 1619; at Alekmar, 1620; at Harlem, 1627; at Amsterdam, 1628. Also in 1642 it was enjoined in the Synod of Enchhusana, that as a means to prevent the progress of insidious error, "catechization should be introduced into families, schools, alms-houses, orphan-houses, and especially in the churches, as well for the young as for the old people, that error might be overturned, and the foundations of the Reformed religion firmly laid."

The Synod of South Holland, during the same time, manifested the same zeal; declaring their faith that the same results would follow a faithful prosecution of this good work. This appears from its acts at Gouda, 1620; Rotterdam, 1621; Gorinnichheim, 1722; Delft, 1628; Briel, 1633; Grafenhague, 1634. In subsequent years resolutions looking to the same end were passed by the Synods of Gelderland, Utrecht, Over Ysee, and others, from 1639 to 1649.

Petro de Welte in the introduction to his exposition of the Catechism earnestly insists that faithful catechization

is the only way in which the ignorance of the people can be removed, and they be fortified against the seducement of all kinds of errorists. "Where there is no vision, the people perish." Prov. 29 : 18.

The greatest number of Christians, so he speaks, for want of catechization, are in respect to their spiritual life, like those children who in their infancy fell into the hands of unfaithful and unmerciful nurses, and thus, not having received their proper nourishment, became dwarfish, and can never afterwards come to a healthy growth. For what is thus lost in the early years of growth and bloom, can never afterwards be regained, however careful the treatment may be which they receive at a later period. Those can only become strong Christians, and come to the full and perfect stature of Christ as adults, who in early life have received the sincere milk of the word that they may grow thereby. The best, and the only remedy to be laid hold of by adults who have been neglected in early life, is to humble themselves and become as little children, and thus submit themselves to the same simple and particular catechization by questions and answers, as that provided for children.

Such are in substance, the views of Teelinck, a Dutch divine, as quoted by de Wette. In another place he insists that both young and old need catechization, as the proper food of the Spirit, more than they need natural bread for the body, and the earthly life. "For it is certain that as long as they have not received simple instruction in the elements of religion, they are not in a condition to be benefitted by the regular preaching of the word in sermons, or to receive other instructions to which they must be led forward. Ignorant of the first principles of the Christian religion they cannot understand the "language of Canaan," however simple the minister may be in his sermons. They cannot receive the deeper truths of religion. "I have written to him the great truths of my law, but they were counted as a strange thing." Hos. 8 : 12. He that will make the trial will find to his surprise,

that many a one called a Christian, who in other respects seems intelligent, and is diligent in his attentions to other weekly and Sabbath duties in religion, has nevertheless very little reliable knowledge in the things of Christ, but stands loose and unconfirmed on the ground of the Christian religion, ready to fall into the arms of any error that may invite him. As a person who has never learned the alphabet, cannot afterwards read right, or one who has never learned the use of tools cannot work at the trade to which they belong, so he who has not learned the elements of religion can make no progress afterwards."

Bucer, quoted by De Wette, who calls him the "excellent Bucer," says: "With other ways of instruction, the Catechism must be used in the churches with earnest labor and constant zeal." Such instruction was practiced in the synagogues, and in the early churches. It was to such instruction that our Lord Jesus Christ submitted, when in his twelfth year he remained in Jerusalem without the knowledge of his parents. After three days they found Him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors both hearing them, and asking them questions. And all that heard Him were astonished at His understanding and answers! Luke 2: 46, 47. Those whom He heard and asked questions were without doubt those teachers who catechized Him and other children. He also asked them questions, and when He was asked He answered them; and this is the true mode of catechizing. So also the early churches had at all times certain persons, who were appointed to catechize, and were on that account called catechists. Such a one was Origen in the church of Alexandria, and in other congregations, others filled a like office and duty. In this way is the doctrine of Christ publicly inculcated, wherever Christ's kingdom is firmly established."

In Germany the custom of catechization was introduced with the Reformation. We have elsewhere* given the commendatory preface from the pen of Frederick III. with

* See in this Review, January No., 1859, pp. 52–54.

which he sent out the first edition of the Heidelberg Catechism, 1563, urging with princely influence and truly pious earnestness its use in the churches and schools of the Palatinate. This pious desire of the noble prince was universally honored. From the time of its first publication to the year 1577, Ursinus explained the Catechism once every year to the students in the college at Heidelberg.

Frederick III. directed the holding of Sunday afternoon catechization. The Palatinate Theologians who attended the Synod of Dort, related that the Catechism scholars in the Palatinate were divided into three classes; namely, the boys and girls; the young men and women; the adults and aged. The first were taught in the schools; the other two were taught in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity by the pastors.

The churches of Julich, Cleve, Berg, Mark, and other German provinces participated in the Synod of Wesel, 1568, in which it was ordained that the Heidelberg Catechism should be used in religious instruction both in churches and schools. In a book of church rules framed for these churches some time previous to 1673, it is said: "The apostolic practice of catechizing shall be immediately introduced in all the churches and schools where it is not yet practiced, and carried forward with diligence, and not only the young, but also the old who are not well instructed, shall be industriously taught the fundamental parts of religion, and thus led on to the true practice of piety. Parents shall not only earnestly admonish their children and those under their care to attend on these instructions, but shall encourage their attendance by their own example; and the Pastors and Elders in their pastoral visitations, which shall be attended to at least once a year before the administration of the Lord's Supper, shall earnestly exhort them to attend to this duty."

In the book prescribing the church regulations for Hesse Cassel, the Anhalt provinces, and in all the free cities, was contained a law making it obligatory on pastors to preach on the Heidelberg Catechism, and catechize from it.—

These catechetical regulations thus introduced were zealously maintained in the German churches. In 1721 a royal edict was sent out from Berlin that all pastors of the Reformed churches which honor the Prussian sceptre, shall explain the Heidelberg Catechism on Sunday afternoons in the same manner as is customary in the churches of Holland.

The Reformed churches in Hungary and Siebenburg from the beginning of the Reformation in those countries introduced and carried forward the work of catechization with great zeal. There was scarcely a synodical assembly held at which some ordinance in regard to catechization was not passed. At the Synod of Goenz, 1566, it was ordained that the ministers should make themselves well acquainted with the Catechism of Calvin, and that they should explain the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer therein presented. The Synod of Herezeg-Pölös, 1576, ordained and directed that in order to restore morality among the people, regular sermons should not only be delivered on all holy festival days, but that at the same time the principal doctrines of faith should be explained to the young from the Catechism. The Synod of Waradein ordained that besides preaching, the young should be instructed at regular times from the Catechism in the public assemblies. The national Synod of Szatmar directed that all the ministers shall explain the Catechism in sermons at least every Sunday afternoon, and that in this service, besides that of Calvin, the Heidelberg Catechism shall also be used. To the same effect are the ordinances in force in the Earldoms of Borsod, Gömer and Hont, in which special attention to the instruction of the young is enjoined. In the articles for the government of the churches in upper Hungary, published in 1667, it is beautifully directed: "The Catechism must not be neglected. The young must, above all things, be well instructed in the foundations of the Christian faith, so that when they have been satisfied with the milk, they may be prepared also for the strong meat." Thus we see how diligently preaching on the Catechism,

and instructing the young from it, was carried on in the Reformed churches of Hungary.

In the great work of catechization the Church in England followed the example of the Reformed Churches of the Continent, and readily adopted suggestions from the continental reformers, for the improvement of the system of catechizing among them. "By the first Book of Edward VI." says Wheatly, "it was not required to be done above *once in six weeks.* But Bucer, observing that this was too seldom, and that in several churches in Germany there was catechising three times a week, urged, in his censure upon this rubric, that the Minister should be required to catechize on every holy-day (Sunday). Upon this exception indeed the rubric was altered, but expressed notwithstanding in indefinite terms."*

The Catechism, ascribed to Thomas Cranmer, and by others to D. Joannes Poinetus, was published by order of Edward VI. in 1553. The King accompanies it with a preface, or commendatory introduction, addressed to school teachers, in which he directs that "all Teachers shall use it in their instructions to the end that they may lay the foundations of religion and knowledge in the young and the ignorant—that they may wisely learn piety and have a guide for their lives, knowing what is to be thought of God who gives us all the good things of this life, and how he is to be thanked for them, toward which all our acts and duties must be directed. Accordingly, by the authority reposed in us, we direct, on severe penalty, that this Catechism shall be diligently used in the schools, that the ten-

* This was not the only reform which Bucer was the means of introducing in the English Church. "In King Edward's first Common Prayer Book, those only were to be sent, (to the minister to be catechized) *who were not yet confirmed.* But because many were then confirmed young, at least before they could understand their catechism, though they might repeat the words of it, Bucer desired that they might still be catechized, till the Curate should think them sufficiently instructed; upon which motion the words were somewhat altered in the next review." *Wheatly's Rational Illustrations of the Book of Common Prayer. London.* 1852. *p.* 376.

der youth by this view of the law and mode of true religion, may be strengthened, and have all encouragement to honor God and fulfill their duties. Herein instructed they will show piety toward God, the Creator of us all, obedience toward the King the Shepherd of the people, zeal for the good of the Church, the Mother of us all; and thus live not merely for themselves, but for God, the King, and the fatherland. Given at Greenwich the 20th of May, in the seventh year of our reign."*

In regard to the catechizing in the English Episcopal Church in modern times, Wheatly says: "The times now appointed for catechizing of children are Sundays and holy-days. Though bishop Cosni observes, this is no injunction for doing it every Sunday and holy-day, but only as often as need requires, according to the largeness or number of children in the parish. In many large parishes, where the inhabitants are numerous, the minister makes himself obliged to catechise every Sunday; whilst in parishes less populous, a few Sundays in the year are sufficient to the purpose." Here there seems to be an abatement of the old faithfulness and zeal. The disposition to make the rubric mean as little as possible, betrays the power of the modern tendency to undervalue this excellent custom, which is the sure way to its gradual neglect and final entire omission. After thus interpreting the rubric in a way which one can hardly help regarding as an accommodation to modern laxness, we need not be surprised that he adds: "But now how to reconcile the fifty-ninth canon to this exposition of the rubric I own I am at a loss: for that requires every Parson, Vicar, or Curate, *upon every Sunday and holy-day*, to teach and instruct the youth and ignorant persons of his parish in the Catechism set forth in the Book of Common Prayer; and this too upon pain of a sharp reproof upon the first complaint, of suspension upon the second, and of excommunication till he be reformed

* Not having the original, we have translated this passage from the German.

upon the third." Evidently the two cannot be reconciled. The canon is in agreement with the ancient good way, and the exposition of the rubric is in the modern spirit of significant and dangerous defection.

In like manner as the Episcopal Church, did also the Presbyterian Church of England and Scotland, early introduce catechisms and catechizations, after the manner of the original Reformed Churches of the Continent. The Synod of Glasgow in 1638 insisted very strongly on catechization, and ordained that each year at least one Visitation of all the congregations should be had; and that on such occasions the Visitors should carefully inquire how religious worship is practiced in each individual family, and with what diligence the catechization of the young, especially in the country churches, had been attended to.

In our country, at a period still within the recollection of the oldest living Pastors, catechization was generally practiced in the Presbyterian churches. The Rev. Ashbel Green, D. D., in the Preface to his "Lectures on the Shorter Catechism," touchingly says: "While memory remains, the interesting scenes will never be obliterated from the author's mind, in which he had before him the children of his congregation—from the age of three to four years, to that of ten or twelve. They were counseled, and admonished, and prayed with, in language the most simple, plain, and tender that could be devised; and never did the speaker find the difficulty so great in addressing any other audience, or in leading any other devotions, as in performing these duties for the lambs of his flock; in adapting his thoughts and language to their capacities, and becoming their mouth to God. They were all taught some little forms of devotion suited to their several ages. Some of the youngest learned the Mother's Catechism; but, eventually, they all committed to memory that on which these Lectures composing the present volume are founded. The children were divided into classes, according to the progress they had made; from those who had learned but

four or five answers of the Catechism, to those who could accurately repeat the whole. Of this last description of learners, a Bible class was formed,* which met weekly in the Pastor's study. The exercises of this class were introduced by an examination on the Catechism, which they were required to repeat throughout; to this succeeded the recitation of their Bible lesson, accompanied by explanations from the Pastor, and the answering of such questions as any member of the class was disposed to propose to him. A short address and a prayer closed the whole."

All this, which was common to the pastors of Dr. Green's time, now sounds "like the voice of years gone by, pleasant and mournful to the soul!" Though the custom described by this venerable divine is all familiar to those who stand in the practice of the catechetical system of the German Reformed Church, and though it is pleasant to the ear to hear the young, thus instructed, in the same Preface, called "catechumens," yet it is at the same time painfully apparent that the idea of catechizing that lay in Dr. Green's mind was widely different from its true original character. At the close of the paragraph just quoted, we would naturally expect him to say that these instructions looked directly forward to the full initiation of the catechumen into the Church, that they were led to expect this, and that this end was reached as a matter of course. But instead of this, it is evident that these catechetical exercises looked in that direction only in the same way as do the instructions of any Bible class or Sunday school. We are immediately and painfully reminded that this was something radically different from the old idea of catechization, by the words which follow the extract made: "The Catechumens thus instructed, soon, of course,"—became full members of the Church? no; though that too may have been so; but it evidently is not in the author's

* This was about eight and thirty years ago. Soon after the year 1800 consequently.

mind, as the end to be looked for directly, and as the proper end of this catechization—"soon, of course, reached the years of maturity, finished their education which, in many instances, was of a liberal kind, and were preparing to enter on business for themselves, and to become heads of families." This catechization was after all a training of the children with the hope only that it *might* lead them *to the Lord*, instead of the true idea of catechetical, educational religion, which recognizes baptized children as standing in the grace of the covenant, and aims, by a firm faith in that covenant, to awaken in them the consciousness of their vantage ground as standing in the covenant of grace, and thus to train them "*in* (not merely *into*) the nurture and admonition of the Lord"—to train them *in* grace, wherein they stand, as the only true mode of training them *into* it more and more.

The catechetical system of the Lutheran Church, similar to that in the Reformed, has an equally interesting history; but its treatment does not fall within the scope of our present purpose. This is the less necessary, as its history is so much like that we have herein portrayed. The system was early introduced, and has been faithfully continued in the Lutheran churches of Europe. From the beginning, it has been practiced in the American churches, and is, we believe, at this day growing in honor in that communion.

The system of catechetical instruction legitimate in the Reformed Church in the Fatherland, was of course introduced in this country with the founding of the American branch of this Church. It has been practiced from the beginning in families, parochial schools, and in Pastoral catechetical classes. Formerly also, as in Europe, in many congregations on Sunday afternoon in the Church. The practice has, of course, varied somewhat at different periods, as to the diligence and efficiency with which it has been plied, but it has always been a prominent feature in all the pastoral operations of the Church. Instead of any

abatement of zeal or loss of confidence in the system, it has, during the last fifteen or twenty years, more than ever occupied the attention of synods, classes, consistories, pastors, and parents. Much has thus been done to advance its efficiency; and many minds are even now turned, with great earnestness and hope, towards securing for its practical use a still higher degree of perfection.

H. H.

St. John's church, Lebanon, Pa.

ART. III.—THE ANTIPODES, OR THE WORLD REVERSED,*

In greeting you on your return, young gentlemen, while wishing you (for it is not yet too late,) a happy new year, we likewise trust that you have enjoyed a merry Christmas. To shew the genuine humanity and sterling warm-heartedness of Lucius Licinius Crassus it is recorded of him that, notwithstanding it was at a time when the Roman Republic was in a deplorable condition, looking towards revolution and civil war, and though he was its firm supporter and defender, yet during the Roman Games, in the month of September, he still found sufficient time, with a few of his choice companions, to betake himself out to his charming villa, a short distance from Rome, and there enjoy with them the jollities of the season. Not that he sought in this way to ignore the coming ills and in a fit of heartless despair to drown his cares in reckless dissipation. Indeed so far was he from shirking the dangers on the occasion that, during the first day of his retreat, assembled with his friends, he looked them steadily in the face and probed their secret causes and ascertained the bearings of these, which brought him to the sad conclusion, it is true, that there was for them no possible remedy, and that of his country the future misfortunes were irrevocably fixed; of which the gloomy prospect they all deeply deplored. Towards the close, however, of the same day, when reclined at the feast, and here we observe his true humanity, dashing aside all his sadness and despondency, he indulged in so rich a vein of humor and threw off in his table-talk such flashes of wit that he kept the board continually in a roar; and more than that, during all the days that these worthy men of consular dignity remained afterwards at the

* An address before the students of Franklin and Marshall College at the opening of the winter session, January 8th, 1861.

villa, casting politics and state affairs to the winds, they discoursed among themselves only on such pleasing topics as rhetoric or the fine arts; which rare conversation of theirs, thanks to the care of our good friend Marcus Tullius Cicero, in his excellent treatise De Oratore, we have still the pleasure of perusing, as forming a delicious part of our light reading during the junior year. After the same manner, my young friends, though I feel sure that you are not, and have not been, regardless of the distressed condition of our gallant ship of State, whose safety is our own, and unobservant of the perilous reefs towards which she seems to be drifting, still I trust that, during the late Christmas holidays, without shewing any recklessness, of course, you have yet been enabled, all cares aside, as a strengthening for the future, to enter unreservedly into their full enjoyment. For my own part, pleased am I to inform you, that, in carrying out this humane philosophy, during our short separation, I have succeeded to my own full satisfaction and I trust also to that of all my entertaining friends. Indeed even now, though since those happy days a solemn fast has intervened, I am constrained to own to you that I feel not yet fully settled down and composed into my proper equanimity and staid sobriety and decorum; and though in my address I have taken especial care to fortify all its parts with the soundest arguments leading to the fairest conclusions, yet as it was composed during the festive days, with all my care, I fear there will still be shewing themselves out of it many quaint oddities and antic whimsicalities and free and easy notions which belong properly only to Christmas times, and are certainly altogether out of place on any such grave occasion as that on which we are called together this morning. Just as in Merry Old England, in earlier times, when Christmas gambols were celebrated a great deal more roisterly than they are at present, on the following days, though the staid burgher might resume his former, regular, every day employment, yet by the saucy set of his cap, or the careless hang of his hose and doublet, or the sly twinkling of his

eye, or the lurking smile around his mouth, it was easily to be seen that his wits were a wool-gathering, as they say, and that, with all his assumed gravity and resumption of business, his head was still running on other matters; in short, that he was ruminating all the while, in sweet recall, upon all those mad carryings on in which he had been participating, the days before, to their full extent, as allowed, without restraint, under the indulgent supervision and encouragement of that rolicking conductor of the revels, the bishop of Unreason or Misrule.

Belonging to the Old English drama, still preserved in choice libraries, is a curious old comedy called the Antipodes, written by one Richard Brome, who had been in his day some sort of a serving man to "rare Ben Jonson." The humor of the thing consists in its shewing off persons and scenes in inverted positions and conditions. The world is turned upside down. Of men and women the occupations are interchanged, and all the customary rights and immunities belonging to persons of higher ranks or of more advanced ages are there assumed and enjoyed by those of lower grades or of fewer years. Servants, for instance, are represented as lording it over their masters, wives over their husbands, and, best of all, young men, affectionate sons, as sending old men, their respectful fathers or grand-fathers, to school.

Such a state of society as this would indicate, although, no doubt, it has often been devoutly wished for by many ambitious servants, imperious matrons and aspiring young men in all ages, is one, however, which we know has never yet been fully realized, or, at any rate, no where upon this lower earth. It is only imagined by the dramatist. Still, we regard it as being not wholly impossible to take place. In some happy country, in the advancement of civilization, the transactions represented in this play may possibly be enjoyed in real life. Brought about indeed we know they could not well be in Old England, or, in fact, in any of the European or Asiatic countries. We make no mention of Africa, as with her interior regions we are not yet fully made

acquainted. Too much in the old world under the restraint of old laws and customs, of established rites and ceremonies, are the people held ever to become so completely emancipated on the one hand and subjugated on the other, so utterly overturned in all their social and domestic relations, as the bringing about of this regenerated state of affairs would require. Brought up among their old castles, old abbies, old ruins, and indeed old structures of every sort, they have instilled into them from these a sort of crouching reverence also for all old folks, male or female, wherever met with, and for all persons in authority; and besides they are held down by the quaintest old maxims and the stiffest old notions. Any innovations attempted upon these they meet with the bitterest scorn and the stoutest resistance, and, if persevered in, they have not unfrequently put the introducers of them to death. Take, for instance, the case of the moon, respecting which, in some parts of the Emerald Isle and of the Land o' Cakes, among the common people it is still the prevailing opinion that it is made of green cheese, or some other material equally evanescent, which is used up regularly every month and renewed the next; and though, in disabusing the minds of some of them of this heterodox creed, some of our modern innovators have succeeded, yet others, in attempting to set others of them right on the subject, have been made to suffer martyrdom, as we have it thus recorded by one of their own poets:

In thae auld times they thought the moon,
Just like a sark, or pair o' shoon,
Wore by degrees, till her last roon
Gaed past their viewing,
And shortly after she was done,
They gat a new one.

This pass'd for certain, undisputed;
It ne'er cam' i' their heads to doubt it,
Till chiels gat up an' wad confute it,
And ca'd it wrang;
An' muckle din there was about it,
Baith loud and lang.

Some herds, weel learned upo' the beuk,
Wad threap auld folk the thing misteuk ;
For 'twas the auld moon turned a neuk,
An' out o' sight,
An' backlins comin' to the leuk,
She grew mair bright.

This was deny'd, it was affirm'd ;
The herds and hissels were alarmed ;
The rev'rend gray-beards rav'd and stormed,
That beardless laddies
Should think they better were informed
Than their auld daddies.

Frae less to mair it gaed to sticks ;
Frae words and aiths to clours an' nicks ;
And monie a fallow gat his licks,
Wi' hearty crunt ;
And some, to learn them for their tricks,
Were hanged and brunt.

If the people of the Old World are thus so religiously jealous concerning the honor of the moon which rides so far above their heads, how great must be their indignation at any innovations attempted on the established order of their own domestic and social relations down upon the earth! Many excellent reforms and advances towards freedom, in the course of ages, we are aware, have been commenced by some nations of Europe and carried out by a few, but with all these, so controlled are they still by their ruling forms and habits, their fixed principles and their old prejudices, that we really think it impossible for the people of any of them ever to become so entirely released from all these drawbacks, so thoroughly revolutionized in all their manners and customs and feelings, as to attain to that charming state of society suited for the enactment of such scenes as those presented in this play: servants lording it, as they please, over their old masters, ladies assuming the high offices of their lords, and young masters enjoying the supreme felicity of sending their old governors to school.

If such transactions are to be realized hereafter any-

where in any civilized country we fancy it is to be nowhere else than somewhere in our own happy America. Here, as all the world knows, we are enjoying the highest state of freedom and equality, and we are the least restrained by old fashioned things and institutions. True, slavery does exist in our Government to some extent, but then, being restricted wholly to certain States, instead of beclouding the bright ideas of liberty and independence which are entertained in other parts of the Union, it acts rather as a foil and sets them off to a fairer advantage. Without this institution in the South never would we have had, by way of opposition to it, in the North and West, any such wholesale liberal sentiments as we have. Indeed just in proportion to the depression of the poor African in the Southern States has always been his elevation in some parts of the North and West. We know of some places where the feeling for him is so warm that he has gone up in common estimation not only to the temperate heat of equality but several degrees above it, being considered by his admirers as belonging to a superior race. Of this persuasion we had a pleasing instance in the remarks of a distinguished lecturer from New York before a convention of abolitionists held lately at Kennet Square in Chester county of this State. To let it be known how devoid he was of any prejudice against the ebon color, which some persons unaccountably entertain, he declared that he had often sat, very comfortably, with those of his friends who bore it, at the same dinner table, and sometimes, in cases of emergency, he had even shared with some of them the same couch. Hereupon, however, was the ire of another brother present, black or white we do not know, greatly excited, because by boasting of such things, he said, the speaker seemed to him to insinuate that the partaking of these hospitalities had been, on his part, a condescension, a lowering of himself to another level, thus casting on the whole colored population a base reflection, as if they were of an inferior race. Our orator, however, immediately springing up again, disclaimed any such intention, assuring the honorable gentleman

who had doubted his zeal, that on such occasions instead of thinking that he was conferring favors or acts of condescension he had rather felt that he was himself the receiver of them, as indeed he would always deem it the highest privilege and honor that could well be granted him, to be allowed occasionally, seated with them at the same table or reclined with them on the same couch, to enjoy the pleasant society and sweet converse of any of his colored brethren. A pleasing indication surely of a decided tendency in our times towards the turning of this western world of ours completely upside down.

In many of the western and middle States the name and office of servant is almost entirely unknown. Some of our free citizens, it is true, being suitably remunerated, consent to oversee the gardens or take charge of the horses and carriages of other freemen in better circumstances; but this, of course, detracts nothing whatever from their equal rights. Lest any such thing should be suspected by any one, it is always made a point, by these independent persons, to hold up their heads with the best, and, above all, never to show, in any way, any deference or respect to any man or woman whatever, as it might materially injure their standing, leading him or her to suspect perhaps that they were no gentlemen. Some of the gentler sex too, for proper considerations, condescend to do the washing and ironing, or attend to the cooking and baking, or to the setting to rights of the chambers of other richer ladies; without giving up, however, any of their inalienable rights; as, for instance, that of partaking their meals seated down with the rest of the family at the first table———to be waved only at such times as when it happens that buckwheat cakes or other slapjacks require their more immediate attention at the same time in the kitchen. If you are desirous of remaining prosperous both at home and abroad, we would advise you to keep, by all honorable means, on the right sides of these familiars, treating them with profound respect, bearing it in mind that they are not just what they seem to be, but ladies is disguise, perhaps stoop-

ing, for the time, to conquer, and be sure always to call themselves, and others of the same class, by their appropriate names, not servants, of course, but helps, or, if you wish to be still more complacent, companions.

Others, however, still more independent than these, to be found mostly in our largest cities, deign not to seek or sue for any such terms of intimacy or equality between themselves and their employers. The interests of these and of themselves they consider to be, in some respects, diametrically opposite; and they wish it to be clearly laid down and distinctly understood what are the separate rights and immunities of each. To the master and mistress of the house, with their family, in each case, is allowed the free occupation and independent use and enjoyment of all the upper halls, parlors and other apartments, wherein by them they will be faithfully waited upon and served in a becoming manner, but to themselves must be left the supreme control and management of all the departments of the lower story. Into these the "upper ten" of the house are not expected to come down, unless occasionally perhaps to see that the larder and buttery are well supplied, that the coal-house is full, and that all the other out-houses and the cellar are properly provisioned. Of the week, especially as their own, they claim certain evenings, wherein undisturbed they may entertain their friends and hold their soirees. With this high life of theirs enjoyed, at such times, below stairs, it would not be very politic, we think, for any interference to be attempted from above, as it might incite their ire and lead them perhaps even to secede from the house and form themselves into a separate confederacy; which would leave the remaining branch in a very deplorable condition. Should a compromise, however, be effected and the union preserved it is easy to be seen which party will eventually rule the roast and maintain the upper hand. It will certainly be those of the lower department. These, however, for their own advantage, will, no doubt, still tolerate and humor the others of the upper stories, as they could not well spare them, being, in fact, their maintainers,

or money-bags, from which they continually derive their means of keeping up their high style of living or of defraying their heavy expenses. This, we think, is another proof of the progress of our times, shewing that this western hemisphere of ours is perhaps even now on the very verge of being turned completely upside down.

In all christendom, we think, there is no country where the female sex is more likely to attain to a higher distinction and dignity than in our own happy land. In other countries, for woman, all that has been asked or demanded by her advocates is that she have laid down for her, and defined distinctly, her appropriate place or sphere, in which she may be allowed the full exercise and enjoyment of all her rights and privileges, unmolested by the other sex. In our own country, however, no such line of demarcation is demanded or desired. Her sphere and that of the other sex, it has been ascertained, are not to be distinguished. By our more advanced reformers they are pronounced to be precisely the same. As among the bees all the males are drones, which by no sort of culture can be converted into any thing else, but all the females, through a suitable system of feeding among themselves, if commenced when they are larvae, are susceptible of being developed into little, busy workers, and of these too any one, selected at the same early stage, if afforded the essential nursing and ambrosia, can be fashioned, and refined and enlarged into a splendid queen-bee capable of ruling over the whole swarm ; so also in the human family, while the intractable, unpliable males can be made to assume, by no possible process, any other characters than their own, by a judicious course of training and culture can the softer sex be modelled into almost any sort of persons you please. Left only to their own whims and fancies and following only the fashions, we all know into what charming, seductive, and sometimes, we must say, even preposterous shapes, are they capable of converting themselves ; these varying too in their shades and dimensions almost every hour ! Perceiving this natural plasticity of theirs, and being concerned,

at the same time, on looking abroad, at the great number of drones belonging to the opposite sex, out of which can be made, by no possible teaching, any things but drones, contort them as you may, to occupy the intended stations of these, for which themselves are utterly unfit, some of our discriminating educators, having caught, no doubt, their idea from the bees, have been attempting, of late years, by putting some of the most susceptible of our young ladies through a thorough course of masculine education, to develope all their latent faculties and bring them out fully formed into accomplished, steady workers or learned professionalists; and we are pleased to know that in these their laudable endeavors they have been eminently successful. When submitted to out-door exercises and exposure, these accommodating, plastic beings, it has been found, become as sturdy as their masculine companions, and if put through the same course of liberal studies in our colleges with young men designed for the professions, when they come out, between the two, you can scarcely tell the difference. Indeed in the western States, where these experiments have been gone into the farthest, they are generally the female scholars, we are told, who shew themselves, in the end, to be the best senior wranglers. Then, when they have taken their degrees how distinguished do they become afterwards in the learned professions, and how very popular as public lecturers!

At the bar, it is true, we have as yet but few female practitioners. From our courts of justice these have been, to a great extent, hitherto excluded; owing partly, we imagine, to the prejudices of the judges against introducing any thing that is contrary to old forms and established usages, and partly, we are inclined shrewdly to suspect, to the fears of the masculine pleaders themselves lest, after this new accession, they would no longer be able to carry their points so well with the jurors, and both they and their clients would be more frequently cast in their suits, on account of the far more persuasive eloquence of their fair opponents. Which fears of theirs, in sooth we must say, are

by no means ungrounded; since the sex, as we all know, are naturally possessed of an intuitive perception, a delicate sense, a faculty, independent of all reasoning or argument, of distinguishing at once between what is right and what is wrong, and of jumping at once at just conclusions, peculiar to themselves, shewn, for instance, in the prompt decisions of Portia, in the Merchant of Venice, when she assumes the ermine, and, of which, we think, not even by the rude jostlings of the crowd, to which they would be exposed in public halls, nor by their close acquaintanceship with crime and the worst side of human nature, would our women be entirely divested when permitted to come forward and plead at the bar.

In Medicine, while in the Old World it is mostly only aged ladies, after long experience in nursing the sick, who at length venture to prescribe some nostrums and appliances of their own, consisting mostly of simple, garden herbs, in this New World of ours, on the contrary, are to be met with many blooming young doctors, scarcely out of their teens, of the feminine gender, who have taken their degrees in surgery and physic and are now doing, in some of our largest cities and towns, in the way of practice, a highly respectable business. They are perfectly at home in their profession. The lancet they know as well how to handle as they do the spatula, and a human subject stretched out before them in full form they can dissect in the most scientific manner, and examine into all its glands and other organs with as much pride and gusto as would some old fashioned lady, presiding at a dinner-table, shew in cutting up and distinguishing the several parts of "a good, fat hen —roasted well."

In theology too we have, in our country, some divine ladies, or perhaps we should more properly call them lady divines, who have acquired an enviable celebrity. Some of them indeed, in their attainments and piety, have left in the rear, not only most of the old theologians, but even St. Paul, the apostle, himself, who, by his enjoining it, in some of his Epistles, on all women to keep their heads covered

in public, and in his saying that they should not be suffered to speak in the church at all, shews that he was entirely behind the present age. The musty, old bachelor! However at home he may have been on theological points, what on earth did he know about woman's rights, or the free and independent institutions of these United States!

Indeed these learned ladies, of whatever calling or profession they may be, in their public speeches or lectures, always shew themselves to be in the van of radicalism and reform. In the pleasant month of May, when the great, religious anniversaries are celebrated in the city of New York, not in the staid assemblies of the old-fashioned set, who would be doing every thing in accordance with the rigid rules of orthodoxy, are the voices of these to be heard, but with those of the free thinkers, the free lovers and free livers of all colors and classes and of both sexes, convened for the sake of breaking down all old forms and ceremonies and setting up the new, are they commingled. So far ahead indeed of all others have some of these reformers gone in their sentiments that by them have been set aside, not only the Epistles of St. Paul but all the Sacred Writings, old and new, as being by far too antiquated for the present, refined age, and our advanced country, and in their place is spread out by them the broad sheet of our Declaration of Independence, in which it is laid down, they are proud to see, as a self-evident truth, that all men, and, of course, all women too, as belonging to the same genus and species, are born free and equal. Indeed so radical and reformatory are their speeches, so full of excited feeling, so denunciatory of every thing that is old and established and so eloquent in praise of equalization, that, in reading the reports of them, as published, it often strikes us that their meeting-places must resemble perfect pandemoniums——Excuse this alliterative slip of the tongue; of course, we mean to say——perfect paradises, or elysiums raised up from the infernal regions——Off the track again! What has come over us! We must have recourse to our notes. Ah, now we have it!——let down from the celestial regions into

this mundane sphere of ours, to be realized and enjoyed, in the highly favored city of New York, as a foretaste of the coming millenium, or——of the world turned upside down.

Among children too no where in the whole world are the manly and business faculties developed earlier in life and more rapidly than in our own land. The little fellows, it is true, after the fashion of those in other countries, may sometimes break up their toys and playthings, but this shows in them only their philosophical and inquisitive turns of mind, as they wish to see into their insides and ascertain their constitutions. It is not from any love of destructiveness that they do this. Somewhere in New England it is said that an infant, not long ago, and we believe such cases are common there, only some ten or twelve weeks old, after having remained on his pillow thoughtfully quiet for a long time, was observed at last to raise up from it, slowly and cautiously, his little head, and resting on his elbow, to lean over the rim of his cradle and look down reflectingly, first on this side and then on that side of it, to see, as every one could read it in his face, if he could not possibly hit upon some happy plan of improvement in its construction, whereby the rocking of it could be conducted in a great deal less laborious and more soporiferous manner. In some parts of our country are no longer known any such periods as boyhood and girlhood. These have been squeezed out of the life of man by his amazingly rapid development. At the age of eight or nine years at most has the full-blown miss, if not cruelly kept back by her envious mother, already come out, as they say, into society, and in crinoline and flounces fully expanded, is carrying on flirtations and making sensations and conquests, and quizzing and giggling and waltzing and, in fact, taking the lead in all the fashionable gayeties of the season. Of the same years, or a few more, the young master too, though not yet fully fledged, but having the yellow down, the incipient indication of the great, "coming event," now dimly but decidedly "casting its

shadow before" on his upper lip, enwrapt in his gray shawl, his shockingly bad hat set knowingly on one side of his head, is seen in all public places, standing forth and discoursing on the affairs of the nation with the sagest politicians of the country, and in turn, while lending them an ear, with his segar held aloof delicately between his forefinger and thumb, as a gentleman knows how, from his pouched out lips, sending up into their faces delicious whiffs of white and fragrant smoke. On all public occasions, requiring great noise and much display, he bears his part manfully, and on nights of grand processions, fully equipt in cap and cape, and holding high his flaming torch, and vociferating with the loudest, he always shews himself to be "wide-awake"——for the good of his country. Owing to this rapid arrival of theirs at manhood and womanhood our young Americans, it is true, may not have left just as many years for going to school as have the youths in other lands where their growth is slower, but on account of their more precocious development, our youngsters can commence this drudgery very early in life, and get through with it the sooner; and indeed being possessed, from the first, of superior natural abilities, especially of those of a constructive kind, they do not need besides any great amount of education.

Though some will not own it, yet we think it is now tacitly understood and believed by all that the great mission of every man into this world is to make as much money as he can. This is the summum bonum, the great magic power after the acquirement of which all other things can be easily made our own. Possessed of wealth we can obtain not only property but also the highest positions in society and the most honorable offices in the State. Possessed of money we can secure for ourselves friends and influence and esteem and love and flattery and pleasure and promotion. In fact there is nothing in the world which we cannot secure if we only have wealth. "Worth makes the man," says the poet, meaning, of course, the amount of money that the man is worth,—"and want of it the fellow."

In an old Catechism, it is true, still perseveringly retained by a certain sect of Christians, and made to be early committed to memory by all their children, to the question: What is the chief end of man?, it is answered that it is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever. Without, however, setting aside this answer and indeed the whole question-book that contains it, as being a superannuated manual, utterly out of date, as we should do, still, we think that the most orthodox retainers of it and sticklers for the text as it stands, if understanding its proper interpretation, can, without straining their consciences in the least, hold on religiously to this precept and yet be able to enter fully into the reigning spirit of the world. By the chief end of man is meant here certainly nothing more than the chief end of the life of man. We cannot see how it could refer to his person. Now neither youth nor manhood can properly be called the chief end of the life of man; because neither of them is the end at all, but one of them is the beginning and the other is the middle of man's life. Of the three parts which compose the life of man, as every one can see with half an eye, it is only old-age which really constitutes its end. Some call it the latter end, and others the principal or chief end. This portion of his days, we are willing to admit, should the devout man consecrate to what is required in the answer to this question; but with a clear conscience, in the first place, can he devote his youth and manhood, the beginning and the middle of his life, its prime and vigor, to the making of money and the enjoying of it for the time.

Knowing then that money is the grand desideratum of life, to be placed before a man as the ultimate object in all his pursuits, our young philosophers, when they take up their studies, very prudently lay hold of only such of these as can be turned by them afterwards to the best practical account in the way of making it. To accommodate their tastes and capacities and to keep up with the progress of the times, it pleases us to know that we have already founded in our country some colleges on the broadest bases, now flourishing, in which are laid down different courses

of studies, any one of which can the student select for himself, leaving the others untouched, or if he chooses, culling out from all his own favorite branches, he can make out for himself his own curriculum; and in doing this it is wonderful to observe the profound wisdom often displayed in his selections. Catch him, if you can, studying Calculus or Conic Sections or Geology or any branches having the word *ancient* prefixed, such as ancient Geography, ancient History, or, worse than all, the ancient Languages, most properly called the Dead. Catch him, if you can, wasting his time and means on Aesthetics. He will have to do only with the practical and the monetary. Catch him studying Moral philosophy. Morals are all good enough in their place, but a young gentleman, when he wants them, can surely put them on him at his pleasure without having to have recourse to books. Indeed with morals, a too close acquaintance formed by a young man, is not always the most wholesome for him, as they very often insinuate themselves into his inmost life and constitution and very seriously affect his whole after course of conduct and prosperity. A too nice sense of justice, a power of too delicately discriminating between what is right and what is wrong, to the man of a tender conscience, if acquired by him, often proves to be a hindrance rather than a help in the way of making money. There is, we know, an old adage which says that honesty is the best policy; but this, we feel confident, must be taken with some grains of allowance. It is all well enough, to be sure, that those with whom we are dealing should believe firmly that honesty is the best policy, but, as for ourselves, if we wish to overreach them a little, it behooves us to be satisfied, we think, with possessing merely the appearance of strict honesty. We should not be so grasping as to desire for ourselves its whole substance.

If honesty is the best policy how came it to pass, in earlier times, that so many of our enterprizing yankees made their fortunes by manufacturing and peddling about and selling to good advantage those ingeniously devised

articles of theirs called wooden clocks, wooden hams and wooden nutmegs? If honesty is the best policy how comes it to pass even now that in New York and Philadelphia are erected so many splendid edifices and private mansions, all through the making and vending, by their humane proprietors, of their secretly compounded and every where published and widely distributed quack medicines? If honesty is the best policy how comes it to pass that our liquor dealers succeed so well as they do, by commingling their potent drugs and coloring matter with common whiskey, in creating wines equal fully to the best Rhenish, and brandies better even than the best Cognac; so that indeed they can pass them off and sell them for these, at an immense profit to themselves, inasmuch as they expended, on the raw materials, out of which they compounded them, but little money in the first place, and then they hold them entirely free of duty and with no cost of transportation? If honesty were the best policy what would become of our mock-auctions, our gift-bookstores and our low-priced jewelry establishments? What would become of Barnum's museum? It would be the breaking up of some of the most respectable houses in the city of New York. In the way of breaking up too, when it must come, how could some of our involved merchants contrive so well to get through with it full-handed, as they call it, and so cleverly as they sometimes do, so that, by merely shifting their names and titles, they are enabled to set up for themselves establishments even larger than before, and on firmer bases, being now freed from all their late encumbrances and liabilities; whereas under the policy of old Honesty they would have had to hang up their fiddles and retire from business, as they would have had to pay off all their old debts? How seriously would this policy affect some of our grocers, their sugar having to remain unsanded, and some of our dairy-men, their milk having to be sold unwatered and their cream unchalked? How seriously would it affect some of our tailors, requiring them to abstain entirely from the use of *cabbage*, as were the follow-

ers of Pythagoras from that of beans, and some of our millers, being not allowed any more to cheer their drooping spirits in their loneliness by taking, by themselves, some extra dishes of toll! How heavily too would it fall on some of our large grain merchants! In selling their wheat they would have to use just the same sized half-bushels in measuring it out as they did when they received it into their granaries,—at an immense loss to their profits. At the several capitols of our States too, and especially at that great one in Washington, how could some of our wise legislators make up their minds on dubious questions, pending in the houses, satisfactorily to themselves, to say nothing of their constituents, as, under the policy of strict old Honesty again, they dare not receive any golden arguments, or material aid, secretly inserted, by some kind lobby members, into their itching palms, which is no sooner felt by them than at once it dispells all their anxious doubts and confirms their wavering judgments? In our departments of State too how would some of our public officers secure for themselves princely fortunes to retire upon, as under the administration of old Honesty they would have to be satisfied with merely their poor pittances of salaries, for all their eminent services, without being allowed to help themselves to their dues by slyly insinuating their abstracting hands into Uncle Sam's large pockets? What would become of the honorable county of Allegheny and of its great manufacturing city of Pittsburg? Their people would actually have to submit themselves to the decisions of the Supreme Court and pay off all that they owe on their repudiated bonds! Were honesty really the best policy then would not only these, but all our artful rogues and swindlers, soon find it out, and, leaving off their less profitable deeds of darkness, they would begin at once to practice it, just for the sake of its policy; and then what would become of our prison-houses, and our courts of justice? What would become of our constables, our criers and our police officers? Of our aldermen, our lawyers and even of our judges on the bench? Their occupation, like that of Othello, would be gone. No. As true now is the

Old Roman adage as it was when Juvenal spoke it: Virtus laudatur et alget,—*Honesty is praised and freezes.* It has no money of its own, and it has not the skill to make any off other persons. It has not even the means of furnishing itself with sufficient clothing to keep itself warm! Much more suitable to the times and easier to be followed is this injunction now in vogue: Make money, if you can, honestly, but if not, make money the best way you can.

We are aware indeed that, when from the line of rectitude it has been swerved ever so little, there is in man, if still pleased and satisfied with himself, a tendency to diverge thereafter from it still further; and as avarice increases with age, we admit that there is some danger that some of our old men, devoted to business, in their too eager pursuit after wealth, may at last step beyond the proper bounds of discretion and commit some overt act of injustice which will render them amenable to the laws. Before, however, they have come to such a deplorable condition of disgrace, it would certainly be proper and highly commendable, for their watchful sons or grandsons, long since ready for action, to step forward and arrest them in their mad career. As in the apiary, to use again our favorite comparison, when the bees have made a sufficiency of honey, it is still customary, in some places, for their keepers advancing kindly, by means of smoke, to suffocate them all to death, and secure for themselves their spoils, so also in this charming state of society towards which we trust we are all fast hastening, it will be both meet and highly praiseworthy, we think, when our old men have succeeded in making a sufficiency of money, and are now becoming a little reckless in their conduct, for their hopeful sons and heirs, having come forward, not just to smoke them all to death, for that, in their case, would be too cruel, but having seized upon all their spoils and property, that they may save the old rogues from the prison and perhaps even from the gallows, to reduce them down at once to their proper grade of second childhood, and to send them all off, as quietly as possible, to school.

There, under the kind supervision of their school-mistresses or young male teachers, they can be instructed in all those studies now required, which, on account of their limited time, they had neglected in their early youth, or, on account of their being wholly absorbed in business, they had forgotten in their manhood. Especially should they be made to attend to such moral, serious instruction as may best tend to draw them away from their evil courses, and induce them to follow after honesty, justice, prudence and sobriety and to practice all good works, so that becoming, at last, gentle, well-behaved and mannerly old men, correct in all their walk and conversation, diligent students, obedient, and respectful towards their sons and daughters, they may pass, with credit to themselves and these, their green old age, and come out at length fully reformed, and, it is fondly to be hoped, well prepared for entering into, and participating in, all the untried realities of another and a better world.

To accommodate the wants of these scholars at this interesting age, the same school-books now in fashion, we suppose, may still be used; but perhaps with some slight modifications, to suit the change. In the old Continental times, before the Revolution, was an old spelling-book written and published, first in Old England, by one Thomas Dilworth, but brought along afterwards, by our provident fore-fathers, into this country, and always put into the hands of their children at school, by them to be thoroughly conned and mastered, in which, among other unpalatable lessons, was contained a fable for their especial edification, adorned with an illustrative wood-cut, to catch and entertain their fancies, all designed to hold up to their serious consideration this old-fashioned, homely moral:

Young Folk think Old Folk to be Fools, but Old Folk know that Young Folk are Fools.

As soon, however, as the colonies became a great United Republic, and liberty had been proclaimed throughout all our borders, from all the spelling-books in the land was, very properly, thrust aside or excluded this dogmatic fable, as being utterly out of taste, and rude and antiquated

in its style, and illiberal in its sentiment, and, above all, extremely disrespectful to the rising generation. When, however, that blessed time has come, when it will be thought expedient to send our old men to school, we think it will be absolutely necessary, under the circumstances, that a new fable of some sort, the very reverse of this, be invented and inserted into their manuals, set off with a suitable engraving, for them to pore upon and consider, all calculated to impress upon their obstinate hearts this solemn wholesome truth, written underneath: *Old folks think young folks to be fools, but young folks know that old folks are fools.* In the ten commandments too there will be needed, in a few expressions, some slight variations, to suit the circumstances, but none of them so material, when made, as to mar the text. Our commentators can introduce them all as improved readings, more consonant to the original. In most of the ancient languages, for instance, the two words which denote child and parent are derived exactly from the same root, and they differ very little in their spelling and pronunciation. In the Greek indeed the same word, *Γενέτης*, means sometimes a father and sometimes a son. Is it then at all improbable that, in ancient times, when the old men had unrestrained control over these matters, and, of course, would have an eye to their own interests, in the fifth commandment, in rendering the two important words in it from the original into their own tongue, they slyly assumed one meaning for the other; and instead therefore of reading it: Honor thy father and thy mother, we would more fully recover and better express the true sense of the injunction by saying: Honor thy son and thy daughter that thy days may be long in the land, &c.? Which would admirably suit the cases of these old scholars; for should they refuse to pay that homage to their children which is their due, they would be very apt to receive, at the hands of these, such treatment in return as would render their days not just quite so long in the land as they otherwise might have been.

Of the advancing tendencies of things towards the complete inversion in society of all our social and domestic re-

lations, we cannot help imagining, especially just now when looking abroad at the portentous signs of the times, that the happy consummation is no longer very far remote. When we shall have passed through the terrors and horrors of a second revolution, and the stars shall have all fallen from our national banner, and itself shall have been rolled up like a vesture, and laid away, never more to be unfurled, and these United States shall exist no longer in reality but only in history, then not unlikely is it that, among the many little monarchies and republics and aristocracies and mobocracies, which will be formed from their ruins, some English traveller, not many years hence, having come over to this country to examine into our novel institutions and various forms of government, will be surprised to find, perhaps somewhere on the site of the New England States, but more likely colonized by these, in some happy valley, hidden coseyly among the Rocky Mountains, just such a little darling of a world as that described by the old English dramatist; having perhaps the very same form of government and institutions, or, if differing in any way, only a little more advanced and improved. At its Capitol, administering the affairs of State, will he meet with some dignified matrons in frilled caps seated in the Senate chamber, and, fulminating, for the public weal, some patriotic boys, of forward parts, in the House of Representatives, and, seated in the regal chair, some distinguished black prince, of the Wooly Head, as president or governor; while, in all the private houses he will find industrious men, middle-aged, by means of patented inventions, such as highly improved sewing machines, self-moving cradles, and self-regulating ranges and furnaces, performing, with great comfort to themselves, all the domestic duties; the old men and old women being all safely out of the way at school. Nay, in his rambles he may stumble on just such a little incident in reality as this, which the old dramatist in his Play has merely imagined: Three old codgers caught playing the truant and brought up by a servant before his young master, the son of one of them, to receive their reprimand and be sent back to school.

SON, SERVANT, GENTLEMAN AND LADY, *native.*

ENGLISH TRAVELLER.

Servant. (*to his young master*). How well you saw
Your father to school to-day, knowing how apt
He is to play the truant!
Son. But is he not
Yet gone to school?
Servant. Stand by and you shall see.

Enter three OLD MEN *with satchels.*

All three (*singing*). Domine, domine, duster;
Three knaves in a cluster.
Son. O this is gallant pastime! Nay, come on.
Is this your school? was that your lesson, hay?
1*st Old Man.* Pray now, good son, indeed, indeed——
Son. Indeed
You shall to school. Away with him and take
Their wagships with him, the whole cluster of 'em.
2*nd Old Man.* You sha'n't send us now, so you sha'n't——
3*rd Old Man.* We be none of your father, so we ben't.
Son. Away with them, I say; and tell their school-mistress
What truants they are and bid her pay 'em soundly.
All three. Oh, oh, oh!
Lady. Alas, will nobody beg pardon for
The poor old boys?
English Traveller. Do men of such fair years
Here go to school?
Gentleman. They would die dunces else.
These were great scholars in their youth; but when
Age grows upon men here, their learning wastes,
An so decays that, if they live until
Threescore, their sons send them to school again;
They'd die as speechless else as new-born children.
English Traveller. 'Tis a wise nation, and the piety
Of the young men most rare and commendable.
Yet, give me, as a stranger, leave to beg
Their liberty this day.
Son. 'Tis granted.
Hold up your heads and thank the gentleman,
Like scholars, with your heels now.*
All three. Gratias, gratias.†

W. M. N.

---

* He means that they are to scrape and make a bow.

† Thanks, thanks." They say it in Latin according to school custom, to show their progress.

ART. IV.—ANIMAL MAGNETISM AND HYPNOTISM.*

The student of science is rarely in a position to explain the real nature of a pseudo-science, when first brought before the public. He is as likely to ignore the truth which it contains, as to denounce the falsehoods which, superposed on the truth, constitute it charlatanry. Time is required to solve the mystery, and the next generation finds that a comparatively easy task, which had been a Herculean labor to its predecessor. In no pretended science has this been better demonstrated than in Animal Magnetism, or Mesmerism, as it was called after Antoine Mesmer—its founder. The cause of some of the phenomena, which could not be classed under the general head of deception, was not even suspected until decades of years had passed away. We are now put in a position, where it is somewhat easy to investigate these through the aids, with which modern science has supplied us. Figuier has presented us with an excellent resumé of all the facts in the history of Animal Magnetism, and we propose to avail ourselves freely of those in the few pages we shall devote to the subject. It becomes the medical profession never to shun an examination ; yet slow and careful deliberation must be employed before we give the result of such an examination, lest, in our haste, we may do irreparable injury to the cause of truth itself. *Festina lente* is a useful motto in scientific, as well as other pursuits.

Antoine Mesmer first appeared before the world, through the columns of a Danish journal, in a letter which obscurely set forth the doctrines that afterwards swelled up to the large proportions and gigantic pretensions of Animal Mag-

* Histoire du Merveilleux dans les temps modernes par Louis Figuier. Tome Troisieme—La Magnetisme animal. Paris, 1860.

netism. He was then a resident of Vienna, but finding his sphere entirely too contracted, he removed, in the year 1778, to Paris, where all his most noted and notorious operations were carried on. In a short time public attention was directed to the pretended influences of the universal fluid, which he asserted was so subtle as to penetrate all bodies without losing any of its activity,—could be employed by the physician for provoking or directing crises in disease or for facilitating the action of remedies. With the view of attaining notoriety, which is equivalent to profit in the case of every quack, he approached the Academy of Sciences. But, although Le Roy, the president, seemed favorable to an examination, this was refused. The Royal Society of Medicine was then asked to examine into the nature of certain cures which he was producing, under the agency of this wonderful fluid, but Vicq-d'Azyr, the permanent secretary, informed him, that having no knowledge of the anterior condition of his patients, they could give no judgment on the subject.

Deslon—the physician in ordinary to the Count d'Artois —was attracted to Mesmer, and worked in company with him. Large apartments were selected for the treatment of the sick or those conceiving themselves sick. In order to accommodate the poor, as well as the rich, *a tree*, at the end of the Rue de Bondy, was specially charged with the fluid, and, around it, at all hours of the day might be seen crowds of persons, strong in faith, whatever might be said of their bodily infirmities. The number of the rich, demanding the attention of Mesmer, became so great that he conceived a special means of affecting crowds without the necessity of *manipulating* in each case, and this consisted in the *baquet* —a tub or bucket, containing a mixture of pounded glass and iron filings, on which were laid layers of bottles filled with water arranged as radii around a centre,—one layer having the necks turned outwards and the next vice versa; —the *baquet* was nearly filled with water. It was covered with a circular lid of oak, pierced with holes, through which protruded bent rods of glass or iron, one end termi-

nating in the water and the other pointed so that it could be applied to the part of the body affected. Around the baquet the parties undergoing treatment were seated, each holding his rod, and being loosely connected with the baquet by a cord. A more ridiculous scene cannot be conceived than this, especially when we imagine the arch-quack solemnly moving around the circle, clad in a lilac robe, manipulating some, touching others with his rod, and generally facilitating the operations of the fluid when it appeared slow and tedious. Figuier says, "mesmerism without the baquet would have been like nobility without armorial bearings, poetry without images, rhetoric without figures, diplomacy without protocols, geometry without axioms, medicine without a clinique, or religion without symbols." It was in fact the very flower and fruit of the new science.

The Faculty of Medicine taking the connection of Deslon—one of its members—with Mesmer, into consideration, suspended him for one year from its roll, with prospective expulsion if he should not disavow his published observations on animal magnetism. The Faculty, however, injured itself and benefitted Mesmer, by pronouncing him a charlatan and impostor without giving him, what he had asked, an examination. Deslon had been punished for associating with a charlatan, but the latter character was not proven upon Mesmer. In the next Spring, Mesmer announced his intention of leaving France, which was protested against not only by his infatuated patients, but even by Marie-Antoinette. The French government offered to constitute a commission for an examination of the subject, but on afterwards modifying the proposition, so as to dispense with the examination, but offering him an annuity of 20,000 livres, and 10,000 livres to pay for the rent of a house, in which he should instruct persons, three to be named by the government, in the principles of his discovery, Mesmer declined, with a number of ridiculous reasons for non-acceptance, and among these the fact that "he wanted territorial property rather than money."

After Mesmer had left Paris, Deslon acted the part of iatro-hierophant. At Mesmer's sessions, when his baquets were surrounded with anxious patients, the soothing sounds of the harmonica were used, Deslon employed the piano forte, and an orchestra at times executed expressive symponies, or vocal music lent its aid to the general soothing influences of the magnetic saloon. The magnetic condition was marked with fits of laughter, yawnings, chills or sweats, "but, most often, with what was considered a happy symptom, motions and agitations of the intestines of a nature easy to understand, when we recollect that Mesmer almost always had taken care to administer to his patients a slightly laxative potion of cream of tartar." Females were the first who showed any additional effects of an influence on the nervous system; painful groans, floods of tears and frightful singultus, rattling respiration and hippocratic countenance suggestive of suffocation,—these were followed by convulsions. The most *endiablées* (the word is excellent, we dare not attempt its translation) were carried into a chamber provided with matresses and cushions on the floor, and with wadded walls. Here they could indulge in all the fantastic movements of hysteria, without injuring themselves or disturbing others. We do not know enough of the secret history of this chamber to endorse it as the temple of Vesta, probabilities incline us to another opinion on the subject.

Mesmer, having returned to Paris, a subscription was raised to form a class, to whom he should impart instruction in his discovery. About this time he treated Court de Gébelin, and making a warm partizan of him, a species of masonic lodge was formed, called "*the Order of Harmony*," with its emblem, consisting of a burning altar, under a starry sky with the full moon, and the motto *omnia in pondere et mensurâ*.

The famous commission, of which Franklin, Le Roy, Bailly and others were members, was appointed by the king, March 12, 1784 to investigate the reality of the soi-disant magnetism. Inasmuch as this commission pre-

ferred to deal with Deslon rather than with Mesmer, the latter protested, but Bailly insisted upon it that the principles of the two were the same. Mesmer, then by a bold-stroke determined to push his opponents to the wall,—he published the names of the first hundred members of the Society of Harmony. These included La Fayette, Montesquieu, Noailles and others of the highest aristocratic circles. Their names were supposed sufficient to stamp mesmerism as certainly genteel, if not true, and, at the same time, to throw discredit upon Deslon and those who held with him. The latter, however, could boast the names of twenty one of the Faculty in the list of his élèves. This boast attracted the attention of the Faculty, who forthwith struck the names of such members from their roll, declaring that *compertum est M. Deslon et quosdam hujusce saluberrimi ordinis doctores, jurisjurandi ac virtutum quae medicum decent immemores, dedisse nomen novae et formidolosae circulatorum militiae, quae facile credulos vanâ tuendae sanitatis spe, delusos mortales detinens, civium saluti, bonis moribus et fortunis, abstrusas molitur insidias.*

Bailly's report had to do with three things promised by Deslon, 1, to determine the existence of animal magnetism, 2, to communicate his knowledge of this subject, 3, to prove its utility in the cure of the sick. The first point was difficult to explain, since it must rest either on assertion or on an exhibition of its effects, the second would only be of service in showing that Deslon was an adept,—therefore, the third alone could engage the attention of the commission. The members soon became weary of the close examination required in investigating the pretended remedial influences, and they proceeded to examine more particularly the physical phenomena exhibited by those under mesmeric influence. The convulsions attracted their attentions, and they did not hesitate to say that there seemed some powerful influence affecting the sick, of which the magnetizer appeared to be the sole depository. They desired experiments should be made on themselves. Deslon himself acted as operator. "But although magne-

tism was energetic in its action on the multitude, it was calm and serene with the savants of the Academy and the Faculty."

At length it was determined to experiment at Passy on persons really sick; most of them experienced no effect whatever. An effort being made to mesmerize Franklin, his secretary and his two nieces, proved also a failure. The Commission reported that, "feeling, imagination and imitation were the true causes of the effects attributed to this new agent known by the name of animal magnetism; and that the use of the so-called magnetism must produce only injurious effects." This report, dated August 11, 1784, was followed by one from the Royal Society (Aug. 16, 1784). After the publication of the report, Mesmer's reputation began to decline, and in the course of 1785 he left Paris, visiting it again several times, during one of which visits he met Bailly on the way to his execution and courteously saluted him. The charlatan had lived his day,—the rest of his natural life was spent in luxurious obscurity, until March 15, 1815, when he died in Switzerland.

We have given, somewhat in detail, the history of Mesmer, and his connection with this pretended discovery. It is not possible within the limits of this article to dwell upon all the phases which animal magnetism assumed under its cultivators. In 1785, the Marquis de Puységur discovered artificial somnambulism, which revolutionized the whole practice of mesmerism. This became immensely popular with military men. "The descriptions given of the phenomena of this somnambulism abound in details absolutely incredible, and yet attested by thousands of honorable, disinterested witnesses." In 1787 Dr. Petetin of Lyons discovered how an artificial catalepsy could be produced by means of animal magnetism, the cause of which condition he considered due to an electric fluid which, proceeding from the brain, was directed by the par vagum towards the stomach and there exercised its effects. Eberhard Gmelin, the physiologist, inclined to the same opinion.

The subject having been brought before the Academy of Medicine again, through the experiments of Dupotet and others, a permanent Commission was appointed on the subject (Feb. 28, 1826), which prepared a report that was presented in June, 1831. This report, made by Husson and never either discussed or adopted by the Academy, admitted the existence of certain phenomena which could not be explained. It became "the pride and joy of the magnetizers." Six years afterwards, the Academy was obliged to undertake a re-examination of the subject, in consequence of attention having been directed to the painless performance of painful operations on persons under the mesmeric influence.

A Commission, consisting of Roux, Bouillaud, H. Cloquet, Pelletier, Dubois, Caventou and three others, was appointed to report upon certain facts which were alleged by Berna—a young mesmerizer—to occur in his practice. Their report was handed in, July 17, 1837, and was decidedly adverse to all the pretensions of Berna. This report brought out a paper from Husson, who felt that his credit was at stake, but the Academy adopted the report of the Commission, which had been written by Dubois. The disturbance, created at this time, induced Dr. Burdin, in September of the same year, to offer a prize of 3,000 francs to the somnambulist, who could read without the use of his eyes, of light or of touch. The Academy accepted the award of this prize, and Dubois, Double, Chomel, Husson, Louis, Gérardin and Moreau were appointed to superintend. But two persons accepted the challenge of Burdin, M. Pigeaire of Montpellier and Dr. Hublier. These failed to perform that which they promised. The failure was so complete that in 1840 Double recommended to the Academy of Medicine, "that it should abstain from bestowing any attention to the subject of Animal Magnetism, in the future, just as the Academy of Sciences refused to occupy itself with the quadrature of the circle and perpetual motion. This proposition was adopted by the Academy, * * * and since the year 1840, when this edict of ostracism was

passed, the Academy has paid no attention to the subject, although that would not prove that it might not take it up to-morrow."

We do not care to present any details of the history of Mesmerism in England or the United States. They would not differ materially from those belonging to its history in France. Phenomena were frequently exhibited, which could not be explained as mere tricks, or the results of self-deception, and yet were not intelligible with the adoption of the theories presented by those who had attempted their investigation. In modern *hypnotism* we have similar phenomena, freed from mysterious surroundings, which may enable us to pilot our way through the stormy waters of mesmerism. "The same physiological data explain also a host of pretended supernatural events, which general history has handed down or the special history of prodigies has collected in the annals of science. It is easy to find among different peoples, various means of enchantment, fascination, &c., which may be considered as of the same nature as those provoked by *the nervous sleep*. The actions and heroes of modern thaumaturgy are thus despoiled of all their supernatural prestige. The state of extatic illumination of a crowd of individuals, and sometimes of entire populations, which formerly so gravely embarrassed scientific criticism, is no longer a great mystery; the marvellous vanishes from this dark territory when science plants a foot upon it."

Hypnotism was discovered by Dr. Braid of Manchester, in 1841. This word was employed to indicate the process by which a person is thrown into a somnambulic sleep. It consists in holding a bright object, between the thumb and middle fingers of the left hand, from six to twelve inches before the eyes, above the forehead, so that the person will be compelled to make some slight exertion with the eyes in order to look at it. The attention must be solely directed to the object. At first the pupils contract, afterwards they dilate. After ten or fifteen seconds have elapsed, on raising the legs or arms gently, a disposition

will be perceived on the part of the patient, if he has been strongly affected, to retain them in the position they have been placed. Special sensations, such as that of warmth or cold, the muscular sense and certain of the mental faculties are at first greatly exalted, as is the case in alcoholic stimulation. This is followed by a depression greater than occurs in natural sleep; the special sensations may instantaneously disappear, and the muscles assume, on the one hand, the most tonic rigidity or extreme mobility. In order to remove the cataleptic condition, it is only necessary to direct a slight current of air upon the rigid organ.

Braid claimed to be able to perform operations on patients in this hypnotic state. Azam of Bordeaux had made experiments on patients to prove their insensibility to pain in this condition, but did not divulge the results obtained until 1859, when he communicated them to Broca of Paris. The latter immediately determined to employ Hypnotism in a surgical operation, with the view of testing this insensibility. The first operation was the opening of a very painful abscess, which was performed without any consciousness of the operation. Velpeau announced this to the Academy, Dec. 5, 1859, since which time, general attention has been given to it in France by physiologists. Further investigations have only shown that the abolition of sensibility is confined to the peripheral nerves, so that hypnotism will never supplant, as an anaesthetic agent, either ether or chloroform. Surgically considered, hypnotism has been a failure, but in a physiological point of view, it is of immense importance as a guide to the comprehension of mesmeric phenomena. It has proven the existence of such a state as nervous sleep.

Figuier presents some prominent facts which have attracted the attention of science, and which evidently are to be classed with those of Hypnotism. Prominent among these are the operations (261 in number) performed without pain by Dr. Esdaile in India, under what he claimed to be mesmerism. These were first published in 1852, and are undoubtedly cases of nervous sleep. The monks of Mount

Athos were said to throw themselves into protracted cataleptic extacies, simply by looking fixedly at the umbilicus. The fakirs of India accomplish the same result by looking at the tip of the nose, from which, they say, after a little while, a bluish flame proceeds, and then the cataleptic condition occurs. The Arabs exhibit similar phenomena, and Dr. Rossi—physician to Halem Pacha—says that hypnotism is employed by the Egyptian sorcerers to produce sleep and insensibility. In the French possessions in Africa, means of fascination are employed of a like character by the *Gzanes* Arabs, and the marabouts of some of the religious sects on the frontiers of Morocco. "On the palm of the hand is described, with some black coloring substance, a circle with a black point in the centre. By fixing the eyes attentively on this circle for a few minutes, they become fatigued and begin to twinkle and get obscured; soon the fatigue is followed by sleep with a species of insensibility." Another method involves the patient's gaze being directed to the light of a lamp behind a transparent bottle, filled with water. In the case of one with a nervous temperament, palpitations of the heart and cephalalgia may be induced.

The fascination which serpents are said to exercise on birds, &c., may possibly be explained in this way. Chickens can be hypnotized by placing them on a board, holding the bill on the same and then drawing a line in front of them, in the prolongation of the bill. This was known in the time of Kircher* and is mentioned in his Ars magna lucidae et umbrae (1646). That, fixed gaze from man on almost all animals will render them quiet and at least for the time, gentle, is known to every one.

---

* Gallinam pedibus vinctam in pavimentum quodpiam depone: quae primo quidem se captivam sentiens, alarum succussione totiusque corporis motu, vincula sibi injecta excutere omnibus modis laborabit; sed irrito tandem conatu de evasione, veluti desperabunda, ad quietem se componens, victoris de arbitrio sistet. Quietâ igitur sic manente gallina, ab occulo ejusdem in ipso pâvimento lineam rectam cretâ vel alio quovis coloris genere quae chordae figuram referat, duces. Deinde eam compedibus solutam relinques. Dico quod gallina, quantumvis vinculis soluta, minime tamen avolatura sit, etiam si ad avolandum instimulaveris.

Having thus shown the fact that there is such a state as has been called nervous sleep, let us see how Figuier applies this by way of explanation to the mesmeric phenomena. The important point, in the employment of the *baquet* by Mesmer, was the distraction of the mind from all surrounding objects and disturbing thoughts; then the movements of the mesmerizer or the object on which the eyes were fixed, became the means of producing the hypnotic effect. Mesmer operated usually on natures that were extremely nervous, and the appearance of convulsions in one case, through the power of involuntary imitation or expectation, would ensure the appearance of similar convulsions in nearly all, especially when they were connected together by a common chord, which they believed to be a magnetic chain.

Should the question rise whether hypnotism would be sufficient to account for the violent nervous phenomena which required those affected to be carried into Mesmer's cushioned chamber, it can be met by the experience in the hospitals of Paris in 1860, where hypnotism produced attacks of most frightful hysteria, and experience taught the operators that it could not be considered an inoffensive amusement, in consequence of the congestion of the brain attending it being very dangerous in some patients. A case given by Gigot-Suard is, in this particular, very important. "A nervous young girl was hypnotized with a pair of scissors held a few inches above the root of her nose. In ten minutes her sleep was complete; as soon as the eyelids closed, she threw herself back in the easy chair, her feet projecting in the air. Her body became as a rigid rod. She did not utter cries, but veritable howls, which were from time to time, interrupted by incoherent words, such as *cemetery*, *death*, *phantom*, &c. She tore her face with her nails, requiring two to restrain her. The frenzy would change for fits of immoderate laughter, followed by tears, hiccoughs and new convulsions," &c. All these symptoms resulted from the use of a pair of scissors, held a few inches above the root of the nose. Surely Mesmer's most astounding phenomena were not more so than these.

Gigot-Suard has also found that it is not necessary to employ a brilliant object, that the contemplation of any object, in some cases, will produce the required effect. The Mesmerizers employ, instead of a brilliant object, the eyes of the operator;—the patient is generally seated on a chair somewhat lower than the operator, which results in a species of strabismus in addition to the ocular fatigue. The manipulations and other processes adopted by mesmerizers only accelerate the effect, by acting on the imagination and the nervous system.

A comparison of the physiological phenomena of the mesmeric and hypnotic conditions will be quite as striking and demonstrative of their identity, as that of the means of producing these conditions has been. The following are common results produced in good somnambules by mesmerizers: "1, insensibility of the periphery of the body; 2, muscular rigidity proceeding, in some cases, to catalepsy, or in, others to marked relaxation of all the muscles; 3, exaltation of the principal senses; 4, exaltation of the intelligence." Now the three first results are common with individuals in the hypnotized state,—the two first, indeed, furnish the proof of the existence of this state, and the third—hyperaesthesia—is thus mentioned by Azam: "Hypnotic hyperaesthesia affects all the senses, except sight, but it is specially manifested in the sensation of temperature and in the muscular sense, the existence of which it demonstrates in an irrefragable manner. The hearing becomes so acute that a conversation can be heard in a lower story; the subjects become very much fatigued by this acuteness; their countenances express the pain, which, the noise of vehicles or that of the voice, gives them; the sound of a watch is heard at twenty-five feet distance. The sense of smell is developed and acquires the acuteness possessed by animals. The patients draw back with disgust from odors that no one else perceives. If one has used ether, or made an autopsy three or four days before, he cannot deceive these patients. * * * The muscular sense acquires such delicacy, that I have seen repeated

before me the strange things which are related of spontaneous somnambulism, and of many of the so-called magnetic subjects. I have seen them writing very correctly, when a large book was held between the eyes and the paper, or threading a very fine needle under the same circumstances, and walk into an apartment with their eyes absolutely closed and bandaged,—all these without any other real guide than the resistance of the air and the perfect precision of movements guided by the hyperaesthetic muscular sense."

In the condition attained by the magnetic somnambule, it is alleged that peculiar powers of knowing the thoughts are possessed. It is difficult to argue on this point, because so difficult to get at the real truth in the testimony adduced. It is impossible that an individual can enjoy, in such a condition, privileges which are foreign to human nature. This is admitted from past experience and by our reason. The burden of proof lies on the other side. "But the exaltation, the remarkable development that the principal senses attain in this physiological condition, and the not less striking exaltation of the intellectual faculties (which undoubtedly results from this same transient activity of the principal senses) render the individual capable of many acts and thoughts which are interdicted in the normal state. He can reflect, compare, recollect better than when in a waking condition ; but he can not exceed the limits of his faculties or of the knowledge previously received. He deceives himself every time he wishes to depart from the sphere that nature assigns our faculties. * * * The transient excitation of the senses of the magnetic somnambule will explain then, according to our opinion, the phenomena which magnetisers have called *suggestion*, or *penetration of thought*. When a magnetizer declares that his somnambule will obey an order mentally expressed by himself, and when the somnambule, which is, however, somewhat rare, accomplishes this *tour de force*, it is not impossible to explain the apparent miracle, which, if it were real, would reverse all the notions of physiology and, we might say, all the known laws of animate nature. In this case,

a noise, a sound, a gesture, any sign whatever, an impression inappreciable to all the assistants , is sufficient to the somnambule, in the extraordinary condition of tension of his principal senses, to make him understand, without any supernatural aid, the thought which the magnetizer wishes to communicate."

Although the facts thus elicited enable us to recognize the identity, or at least the close relationship, of Mesmerism and Hypnotism, and to refer them both to a physiological condition, still the explanation of this physiological condition is wanted. Honest study may now furnish us results which could not have been attained in the last century when Mesmer first attracted attention by his singular phenomena. Physiology and Psychology must go hand in hand in the investigation. So long as the facts were mixed with charlatanry, it was difficult to attract the attention of the students of either science to this investigation. What is the physiological condition under which these phenomena are produced? The terms, *magnetic somnambulism*, *nervous sleep*, *hypnotic state* are only names, but they indicate a condition, the producing cause of which is as certainly open to study as its effects.

L. H. S.

Baltimore.

Art. V.—NOTES ON THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS.

BY PROF. ADLER, OF NEW YORK.*

"The scene of the play is at Argos in front of the royal palace, on the flat roof of which is stationed a watchman awaiting the fire-signal, that was expected to announce the fall of Troy. In the foreground are altars and images of the Gods. A part of the decoration represents the city of Argos. The action begins with the close of night. The chorus is composed of fifteen aged men from among the leading citizens of Argos, who, in the absence of Agamemnon, probably constituted the nominal council of the queen. This accounts for his presence at the royal mansion as early as the break of day, in order to attest his vigilance for the common weal and his loyal devotion to the interests of the sovereign; perhaps to learn the pleasure of the queen. His solicitude in behalf of Agamemnon is based on the prediction of Calchas (v. 144) and not upon the infamous intercourse between Clytemnestra and Aegistos, which seems to have been unknown to him until it was divulged by Cassandra." * * *

Schneider.

V. 1. *Θεοὺς μὲν αἰτῶ τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγὴν πόνων, κ. τ. λ.* For the *μέν* of this verse it has been difficult to find a proper correlative. The *καί* of v. 8, and the *δέ* of v. 20, have been proposed, but neither of them appear to have sufficient adversative force here. The former is entirely inadmissible, as the *καὶ νυν φυλλάσσω* denotes no opposition whatever, but a bare coördination of thought; and like *κάτοιδα*, is to be directly linked to *ἦν κοιμώμενος* of v. 2. The *δέ* of v.

* These notes were prepared with reference to the text of Wellauer. But the numbers prefixed to each note refer to Dindorf's revision of Porson's text, as published by Teubner.

20 is more plausible, though it must be confessed, that there can be no very rigorous opposition in sentences that express the same thing in nearly the same terms. I am, therefore, inclined to regard the particle in question as the *μέν solitarium*, h. e., the adversative limitation corresponding to the concession made by *μέν* is entirely wanting and to be supplied in thought. If this be admitted, then the purport of the passage would be as follows: "Of Gods at least I ask release from these my toils," they are the only power that I can ask, others I neither can nor dare ask. cf. Kühner's Ausführl. Gramm. Vol. 2. § 734, 2.

V. 64. *κονίαισι*, very frequently in the pl. (=*arenae*) with reference to its composition, as consisting of many parts or particles. Sense: "The knee braced against the sand of the arena."

V. 65. *ἐν προτελείοις*, in the beginning of the battle, at the commencement of the fight.—*Προτελεία*, sc. *ἱερά*, Opfer das einer Handlung als Einweihung vorangeht.—Sühnopfer.

V. 66. *θήσων*, in the sense of "imposing on, causing," *πολλὰ παλαίσματα* for its object.

V. 68. *τελεῖται*, i. e., "It will be accomplished according to the decree of fate."

V. 69. *ὑποκλαίων*,, "weeping a little, or secretly, by stealthy tears (sobs)."

V. 70. *ἀπύρων ἱερῶν*, "for, on account of the fireless (i. e. unperformed, unoffered) sacrifices," or of the deities (furies), whom no sacrifices can appease.

V. 71. *ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς*, the unyielding anger (of the Gods).

V. 72. *παραθέλξει*, "will appear, soothe." In this sentence the subject understood is *τὶς* with *οὔθ'* ="no one." The passage may be rendered: "Nor shall any one by secret sobbings, by secret libations or by the shedding of tears, appease the inflexible wrath of the fireless deities (i. e., the Furies); or else: the inflex. wr. of the Gods on account of the neglected (fireless) sacrifices."

V. 74–75. *ἰσχὺν ἰσόπαιδα νέμοντες*, "pasturing, husbanding, managing our childlike (feeble) strength with the staff," i. e., supporting, aiding it.

V. 78; *ἰσόπρεσβυς*, 1. Gleich alt; 2. dem Alter gleich: "for when youthful marrow is ruling the breast within, as in old age, and when (on the other hand) Ares is not in the place (at the same time), then over-aged, or as in over-age, &c."

V. 79. *φυλλάς*, Blätterhaufen; Lager von Blättern; Oft mit Blättern = "foliage" simply.

V. 82. *ἀλαίνει* (= *ἀλῶνται*) umherschleichen: "sneaks, sinks, walks, runs about like a day-dream."

V. 93. *ἀνίσχει*, "rises aloft, ascends, mounts up." (Said also of the sun).

V. 94. *φαρμασσομένη*, "(healed, cured), tempered, adorned, colored, mixed, seasoned."

V. 95. *ἄδολος*, truglos, arglos, kunstlos, ohne List, "fraudless, unadulterated."

V. 95. *παραγορία*, 1. Zureden: 2. Trösten, Lindern, Mildern; Milderung. Render: "Tempered with the soft and fraudless admixture of the sacred unguents, the royal oil from the cellar."

V. 96. *πέλανος*, *ὁ*, 1. Opferkuchen; 2. jeder Teig, Brei; any viscous substance, e. g., wax, oil: blood, gore, &c.

V. 96. *μυχόθεν*, aus dem Innern, i. e., "from within, from the recesses of the palace."

V. 98. *αἰνεῖν*, 1. lit. loben, gutheissen, i. e., dulden; 2. (in Aeschyl. only) "to speak, promise; here: to disclose."

V. 99. *παιών*, 1. the physician to the Gods; 2. physician, healer generaliy.

V. 101. *ἀγανά*, freundlich, mild, liebreich, "bland."

V. 101. *φαίνους'*, the verb—wedeln, schwänzeln, streicheln, schmeicheln. Then: "blandly flattering hope."

V. 102. *φροντίδ'*, Sorge, Bekümmerniss—"apprehension, anxiety."—*ἄπλησον*, nicht auszufüllen, unersättlich. Connect this with *λύπης*.

V. 103, *θυμόβορον*, herzzerfressend. The entire passage may be Englished thus:

> "And he the healer of this care,
> Which now becomes the enemy of the soul,
> And then again, as flattering hope,

From sacrifices blandly beaming,
Protects the mind, insatiate of grief,
From heart-corroding sorrow."

V. 104. *κύριός εἰμι*, "I am master, have it in my power to announce (proclaim), &c. *θροεῖν*, schreien, tönen; transitively: ertönen lassen, laut werden lassen, *erzählen*, *sagen*.

V. 104. *αἴσιον*, glückbedeutend, günstig: gebührend, gehörig, erforderlich, glücklich. "The strength or might, propitious of its way, or the expedition, of full grown, perfect men."—*ἐκτελής*, vollendet, vollreif, regal? royal? (Voss). Render then: "It is in my power to proclaim the might of perfect men (of full-born heroes) successful in its course, auspicious on its way—or the auspicious power attending the path (career) of noble men; or the might of noble men attended by auspicious omens on its way."

V. 107. *σύμφυτος*, 1. mitgewachsen, angeboren;—the time having grown up with me from my birth.—2. zugewachsen, zugetheilt;—3. dicht verwachsen. In this place perhaps: "congenitus," co-begotten?—*αἰών*, ὁ, Zeit, Zeitraum, Lebenszeit, Leben; Menschenalter. Co-begotten, age or times: "For yet persuasion, sprung from Jove, inspires my song, and co-begotten time my strength (courage, prowess, valor)." For other readings cf. Schütz and Klausen.

V, 108. *ὅπως*, when, what time.

V. 110. *σύμφρονα ταγάν*, the adjective, gleichgesinnt, like minded, harmonious; the substantive Ordnen, Befehlen; Oberherrschaft, Oberbefehl, in apposition with *κράτος*; the abstract for the concrete: "the unanimous commanders of Hellas' youth," or, "innig in Herrschaft."

V. 115. *ἀργίας*, (= *ἀργός* of Schutz) is probably a wrong reading for *ἀργᾶς*, *ᾶντος*, a Doric contraction of *ἀργάεις*, the Doric form of *ἀργῆεις*, weiss, glänzend.

V. 115. *ἐξόπιν*; this word is not in Passow. Perhaps some variation of the forms *ἐξόπιθεν*, *ἐξόπιθε*, poet. for *ἐξόπισθεν*—hinterwärts, rückwärts, dahinter, im Rücken.

V. 119. *λαγέναν*, adjective of *λάγενος*, *η ον* (= *λάγειος*) only found in Aeschylus, from *λαγώς*: relating or belonging to the hare, of the hare, hare. . . . Compos.

V. 137. *αὐτότοκον*, Schol. *σὺν αὐτῷ τόκῳ*: zusammt der Leibesfrucht,, together with its brood. But with changed accent *αὐτοτόκος*, it is active : selbstgebärend.

V. 141. *δρόσοισιν—δρόσος*, lit. dew, metaph. alles Zarte, Frische, Weiche, i. e., whatever is soft, fresh, tender, new. Here—*τοῖς νεογνοῖς*.

λεπτός, abgeschält, metaphor. zart, fein, zierlich. Schneider: *ἀέλπτοις*, den unerwünschten od. keine gute Hoffnung für die Zukunft gebenden.—Others still *ἀέπτοις*, zu schwach, um folgen zu können, (from *ἕπομαι*).—Still others lastly *ἀάπτοις*, *haud laedentibus*. Cf. Passow, Wellauer, Schütz, &c.

V. 143. *ὀβρίκαλα, τά* (– ⏑ ⏑ ⏑) Aeschyl. = *ὄβρια, τά*, (from *βρύω*) the young of animals, whelps. Passow.—Schneider derives it from *βρίζειν*. Vid. notes. Photius says : *ὄβρια καὶ ὀβρίκαλα· τὰ τῶν λεόντων καὶ λύκων σκυμνία.*—Cf. Spanheim's note.

V. 144. *τούτων*, here="on this account, therefore, wherefore." *τερπνά*, adverbially, zu ihren Gunsten. Schneider. In construing this sentence, you can either make *Ἄρτεμες* the subject of *αἰτεῖ* and supply *μέ*, or else make *φάσματα στρουθῶν* the nominative. "Therefore she calls upon (bids) me to make (regard) the appearance of the birds omens propitious indeed (*μέν*), but still of doubtful import."—*κατάμομφα* is here =*κατάμεμπτα*, liable to blame, to be found fault with, *culpanda*.—*κρᾶναι* is explained by *φάναι* by the Scholiast. Schütz proposes *αἰτῶ* for *αἰτεῖ*, unnecessarily.—*στρουθῶν* is correctly referred to *ἀετῶν* above.

With reference to the entire passage the Scholiast remarks : *δέξια δία τὴν νίκην, κατάμομφα δία τὸν χόλον Ἀρτέμιδος*, i. e., *faustis illis quidem ob significationem, sed culpandis tamen ob numen Dianae laesum.—ξύμβολος* et *ξύμβολον in neutro dictum proprie de avium augurio ex eorum occursu et signo quod inde capiebatur*. Spanheim.

V. 146. *ἰήϊον——Παιᾶνα*, refers to Phoebus, the averter of evil, whom the prophet beseeches to appease the anger of Artemis. The Scholiast, in explanation of the character in which Apollo is here invoked, adds: *ὡς μάντις* (bet-

ter *μάντιν*). The epithet *ἀλεξίκακον*, however, is more becoming. *Παιάν* designates the deity as the physician to the Gods, and more generally as the healer, the redeemer from evil. In this capacity he was wont to be invoked with *ἰή, ἰή*, exclamations of distress. Hence *ἰήϊος*, one who is called upon by those in agony or distress, "the helper, deliverer;" or, if it be derived from *ἰάομαι*, "the healer." Thus Sophocles in the Oed. T. has *ἴἡτε Φοῖβε*, and again *ἴἡτε, Δήλιε παιάν*; and Callimachus in his Hymn to Apollo, addresses the God by *ἰὴ ἰή παιῆον* and *ἰὴ ἰὴ παίων*. Bacchus was likewise hailed by a joyous *ἰὴ ἰή*, "*tanquam ἵλαρον et quo esset ἵλεως seu propitius.*" Spanheim.

V. 149–150. *μή—τεύξῃ*. The implied subject of this sentence is the *ἁ καλά*, i. e., *Ἄρτεμις*, of v. 140. The Scholiast adds in explanation *ὦ Ἄρτεμι*, in the vocative, thus making *τεύξῃ* the second person middle subjunctive Aorist. This is in perfect accordance with the Attic idiom, in which, in negative and prohibitive propositions with *μή* the subjunctive Aorist is regularly employed as a sort of gentle imperative, expressing a prayer or wish that something may not take place, the Aorist being chosen in preference to the Present, to denote the action of the verb in an absolute manner and without any reference to time. Cf. Kühner's Ausführl. Gramm. Vol. II, § 469, 3. If this explanation be adopted, then *μή–τεύξῃ* constitutes an independent sentence, and is rendered in connection with the preceding verse, thus: "I invoke (i. e., I beseech thee by) Phoebus, the healer and helper in need, do not (or: O, mayst thou not) Artemis, ever prepare for the Greeks, by contrary winds, tedious, ship-detaining delays (of their voyage)," &c.—If, however, on the other hand, we regard *τεύξῃ* as the third person of the subjunctive Aorist active, then the order is: *καλέω Παιᾶνα μὴ* (*Ἄρτεμις*) . . . *τεύξῃ*, *κ. τ. λ.* "I call upon Paian, that Artemis may not prepare, i. e., to prevent Artemis from preparing, &c.," and then the clause introduced by *μή* is a dependent final proposition.—*ἐχενήδας*. The common reading was *ἐχενηίδας*, which Blomfield and others after him have contracted in-

to the present form for the sake of the measure. Compos. ἔχω and ναῦς.—ἀπλοίας the contrary of εὔπλοια.

V. 151. σπουδομένα, the Doric for σπουδομένη, "setting on foot, hastening to prepare for yourself, or with a view to obtain or prepare for your benefit."—Others read σπενδομένα with less propriety.—ἑτέραν, *aliam ac qua opus est, mutatam in pejus*, κακήν, *infaustam* (Bothe); or else: *aliam praeter Iphigeniam victimam caedemque accelerans* (Haupt).—ἄδαιτον is explained by the Scholiast by ἣν οὐδεὶς ἔδαισε, i. e., (a sacrifice), which no one ever partakes of, on account of it being human.

νεικέων τέκτονα σύμφυτον, "the worker," i. e., "the cause of contention among kinsmen," between husband and wife. σύμφυτον here=συγγενεκήν (Schol.), and is in this instance, as frequently elsewhere, by hypallage made to agree with τέκτονα, when it properly belongs to νεικέων. The usual, proper, order would be: νεικέων τέκτονα συμφύτων. This is said with reference to the quarrel between Agamemnon and Clytemnestra, to which the immolation of Iphigenia gave rise.—The οὐ δεισήνορα is to be referred to Clytemnestra: *virum non timentem, jura matrimonii violantem.* The Scholiast explains it by οὐ φοβουμένην, ἢ οὐ δείσασαν τὸν ἄνδρα.

V. 153. παλίνορτος. This is the form adopted by Wellauer and Schneider instead of the more usual παλίνορσος. It is sustained by the Etymologicum Magnum, p. 648: ἐχρῆν διὰ τοῦ (τ) γράφεσθαι, οὐχὶ διὰ τοῦ (σ). Its signification is: *semper denuo resurgens*, said with reference to the frequent family disasters and crimes of the Pelopides, which the vengeance of Clytemnestra would again revive. The Scholiast's explanation ἡ (i. e. μῆνις) ἐξ ὑστέρου ὁρμωμένη, and that of Photius ὀπισθόρμητος are less in accordance with the etymology of the word and less forcible. Epithet is here heaped upon Epithet, in order to heighten the pathos and terror of the description: "For there will remain (i. e., await, sc. Agamemnon after his return) the frightful ire (φοβερὰ μῆνις), again roused from its slumber (παλίνορτος), ever mindful, i. e., of past injuries (ἀνᾶνων =

μνῆνων), child-avenging, treacherous keeper of the house." The present *μίμνει* is used for the future, in order to give an air of certainty to the prediction.

V. 156. *ξὺν μεγάλοις ἀγαθοῖς*, sc. *διὰ τὴν νίκην* (Scholiast). The great blessings relate to the taking of Troy;—*ξύν*, along with, besides.

V. 157. *μόρσιμ'*, "decreed by the fates," in a bad sense, *fatalia, funesta.*—*ἀπ'*, from, i. e., judging from, inferring it as a consequence of their appearance. This is the *κατάμομφα δέ* of v. 144—. The dat. *οἴκοις βασιλείοις* depends on *μόρσιμα.*

V. 158. The Scholiast makes *ὁμόφωνον=ὁμοφώνως.* Turnebus reads: *τοῖς δ' ὁμοφρὼν ὤν.*

V. 169. *Ζεὺς ὅστις, κ. τ. λ.* The Ancients frequently express an extreme timidity and delicacy of feeling in addressing the supreme Ruler of the Universe, lest they should incur his displeasure by giving him a wrong or less acceptable name. Thus, for example, Socrates in Plato's Philebus remarks: *τὸ δ' ἐμὸν δέος, ὦ Πρώταρχε, ἀεὶ πρὸς τὰ τῶν θεῶν ὀνόματα οὐκ ἔστι κατ' ἄνθρωπον.* Hence they often employ, as does our poet here, some conciliatory formula, beseeching pardon and indulgence for their ignorance or error. So Euripides Troad. 846 addresses Jove by

> *Ὅστις ποτ' εἶ σὺ δυσόπαστος εἰδέναι,*
> *Ζεύς, εἴτ' ἀνάγκη φύσεως, εἴτε νοῦς βροτῶν,*
> *Προσευξάμην σε.*

And Catullus in his hymn to Diana, after having invoked her under various names, concludes with:

Sis quocunque tibi placet, Sancta, nomine. Cf. also Euripides Hercul. Fur. v. 1263 (ed Pflugk): *Ζεύς δ', ὅστις ὁ Ζεύς*, &c. and Plinii Hist. Nat. II, 7. *Illud, quidquid est, summum.* The pronouns *τόδ'* and *τοῦτο* of v. 160 may be regarded as accusatives and rendered abverbially: "thus, in this manner," i. e., by this name. *κεκλημένῳ* is by attraction made to agree with *αὐτῷ*: "if thus to be called is pleasing to him."

V. 164. *οὐκ ἔχω, κ. τ. λ.* This obscure passage has been the subject of a variety of interpretations and has been rendered differently by nearly every commentator. Schütz,

who mistakes the meaning altogether, cuts the knot by making changes in the text, which are however unsupported by any other edition or manuscript. He reads: *οὐκ ἔχει τις εἰκάσαι* instead of *οὐκ ἔχω προσεικάσαι*, with reference to *πλὴν Διός*. He furthermore changes the *εἰ τὸ μάταν* of v. 165 into *εἰ τόδ' ἐμᾶς* and translates: *Nemo enim possit discernere, etiamsi omnia perpendat, praeter Jovem, utrum hoc meae curae pondus vere oporteat abjicere.* This would make excellent sense, if such liberties could be admitted. Schneider retains the usual reading of the text, and taking *προσεικάσαι* in an absolute sense renders: "I can not institute any comparison (whatever), balancing all things in my mind with the exception of Jove," i. e., although I balance or canvass all things out of (that have their existence apart from) Zeus, yet I cannot compare aught unto him, if sorrow is really to strike the folly of thought (*τὸ μάταν ἀπὸ φροντίδος*), i. e., if punishment is truly to follow foolish or rashly criminal resolves, as was the case, for example, with Agamemnon, whose pusilanimous consent to the immolation of his daughter was destined to meet with a fearful retribution from Jove. According to this rendering the poet's object in this sentence would be to celebrate Zeus as the avenger of temerity and sin. But this idea is far-fetched and has no manifest relation to the context. The Scholiast interprets: *οὐκ ἔχω ὅμοιόν τι εὑρεῖν τῷ Διΐ, εἰ χρὴ ἀληθῶς ἀποβαλεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς φροντίδος καὶ τοῦ λογισμοῦ μάταιον ἄλλο ἄχθος*, "I can find nothing to compare to Zeus, if there is need of really casting away (of excluding) from further thought the useless weight of other care or speculation," and adds: *τὸ γὰρ περί τινων ἄλλων διαλογίζεσθαι μάταιον ἄλλο ἄχθος.*

Blomfield, adopting the general idea of the Scholiast, renders *φροντίδος ἄχθος* by *conjecturæ onus*, and refers it to the difficulty on the part for the chorus of finding the proper name of Zeus, as indicated in the preceding sentence. This explanation would read in English: "I can not by comparison find out (*προσεικάσαι*), though I should search the universe around, another name (for the Supreme One), save that of Jove (Zeus), if indeed I may be permitted to

cast away the useless weight of any further conjecture," i. e., solicitude in regard to the nature and name of him who really is God. This interpretation is also adopted by Bothe. Humboldt, however, treating *πλήν* adverbially and making *Διός* remotely dependent on *προσεικάσαι*, translates:

> Nirgends weiss ich auszuspäh'n
> Sinnend überall im Geist,
> Ausser bei Zeus, ob mit Recht ich vom Herzen die Bürde
> Dieser Sorge wälzen darf.

> Never can I find it out,
> Ever searching in my mind,
> Save from Zeus, whether I may justly roll from off my mind
> The weight of this solicitude.

Although the first part of this rendering cannot be sustained, yet the conclusion of it is the most natural and most in accordance with the previous import of the choral ode. The term *φροντίδος ἄχθος* has no reference to any anxiety concerning the name or nature of Jove, but designates the solicitude of the chorus in regard to the dark forebodings implied in the prediction of Calchas, which Zeus the Supreme alone is supposed to be able to bring to a happy issue. Hence he becomes the source of hope and is made the object of praise. *προσεικάσαι* may therefore be taken in its usual sense and *τὶ* (or *τίνα*) *αὐτῷ* supplied as its objects; *μάταν*, though an adverb, may be rendered as an adjective, and *ἀπὸ .... βαλεῖν* may be read *ἀποβαλλεῖν*. We then translate:

> I can compare none unto Him,
> Though I may balance all within,
> Save Zeus alone, if I may cast (on whom I may cast)
> Effectually from off my mind
> The idle weight of this solicitude.

V. 167–171. *Οὐδ' ὅστις πάροιθεν ἦν μέγας, κ. τ. λ.* The poet now proceeds to celebrate the greatness of Zeus as compared with that of his predecessors, of the powerful enemies and rivals vanquished by his prowess. Several commentators link this sentence to the preceding by expanding the *οὐδ' ὅστις* into *οὐδ' ἔχω προσεικάσαι ἐκεῖνον, ὅστις κ. τ. λ.*, but this is certainly superfluous, if not erroneous, as the

ἐκεῖνος implied in ὅστις most obviously refers to λέξαι as its predicate. This λέξαι is not the infinitive, by which Humboldt has rendered it in his "Kein Erwähnen is das mehr," but the third person singular optative.—The double negative οὐδ'—οὐδὲν is emphatic. The Scholiast refers ὅστις . . . ἦν μέγας to the giants in general and θράσει βρύων to Typhon, the giant κατ' ἐξοχήν. But this is an error. Before the time of Jove (πάροιθεν) Uranus was the all-powerful deity, strutting with all-conquering assurance, i. e., supported by the Titans, the all-subduing allies and supporters of his throne. He was succeeded by Saturn (ὃς δ' ἐπειτ' ἔφυ), who reigned during the life-time of Jove, but could not maintain his supremacy against him.

The word θράσει may stand objectively, i. e., not in the sense of courage, confidence, insolence, but that which inspires them, the resources or supports of confidence.—Instead of οὐδὲν ἄν, others, as for example Haupt, alleging that ἄν with the optative is not essential, read οὐδὲ ἕν, and Schneider puts οὐδὲ δ' ἕν as in all probability the primitive reading. In explanation of the term τριακτῆρος the Scholiast adds: νικητοῦ· ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ἐν τοῖς πεντάθλοις ἀποτριαζόντων ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι νίκης, the victor who in the pentathlon had thrice floored and vanquished his antagonist, here applied to Jove, in order to set forth more forcibly the arduous nature of his contest with his former rival, and the completeness of the victory. With reference to this passage Bothe justly observes: "Magnifice enim Jovis dignitatem poëta efferens nec quid quam ante illum fuisse dicit, et post exortos adversarios ab ipso victos periisse; quapropter, qui Jovis numen colat et ab eo praeclare gesta celebret, illum sapientiae laudem consecuturum esse."

In regard to the grammatical idioms οἴχεται τυχών and λέξαι πρὶν ὤν, the student will consult his grammar. The entire passage may freely be rendered thus:

> Nor could he who erewhile was great,
> Exulting in all-warring power,
> Say that his might was aught before;
> So he who afterwards was born
> Met soon in Jove his conqueror.

V. 172. *τὶς=πᾶς τις*, "Every one, any one."—*Προφρώνως*, *alacriter*, *libenter*, *propense*.—The verb *κλάζειν* is commonly followed by the accusative of the immediate or direct object and by the dative of the remote, or of the person. So above v. 157 and 201 below. The poet, however, who is fond of bold and unusal constructions, often puts, as in this instance, *two* accusatives, the one of the person and the other of the thing. Bothe says *ἐπινίκια=ἐπινικίοις*, but it is preferable to say *Ζῆνα=Ζηνί*, *Jovem victorem carminibus celebrans*, shouting songs of victory to Jove. The Scholiast explains *τεύξεται φρενῶν τὸ πᾶν* by *ὁλοσχερῶς φρόνιμος ἔσται*. Bothe with Schneider claims for *φρενῶν* the signification of *laudis sapientiae*, Lob der Verständigkeit, and sustains the definition by a number of parallel passages. Humboldt renders freely and elegantly: "pflücket ganz des Geistes Frucht," culls the fruit of wisdom all (entire).—*τὸ πᾶν* is here the adverbial accusative and *=πάντως*, *ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ*, in all things, in every respect, throughout.

V. 176. *τὸν ὁδώσαντα*, the participle of nearer definition (usually rendered by a relative clause), agreeing with *Ζῆνα*. *Φρονεῖν=ὥστε* (*ὡς*) *φρονεῖν*, *ducentem mortales in viam ita ut sapiant*, i. e., *qui sapere mortales docet*.—*κυρίως* and *θέντα* belong together: "Establishing it as a fixed principle, making it an eternal law," or as Humboldt has it: setzend e-wig festbestimmt.—The subject accusative to *ἔχειν* is *αὐτούς*, i. e., *τοὺς βροτούς*. Schütz needlessly changes *τῷ πάθει μάθος* into *τὸν πάθη μάθος*, *κ. τ. λ.*, *hanc quasi legem sancit, ut quae noceant, eadem et doceant*. The Scholiast explains by *παθὼν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω*. The phrase seems to be an adage, the origin of which the poet refers to a sovereign decree of Jove: "that they might learn by suffering, be taught by experience." Hence the rendering of Voss: "ihm, der Leid belehrt" als gesetz hat aufgestellt."

V. 179. *στάζει πρὸ καρδίας*, "distills forth from the heart." "*Dicitur dolor: qua imagine saepius utitur Aeschylus, ut graves animi affectus cor quasi inundare, seu in cor stillare dicantur propter sanguinis scilicet effusionem, ejusque in corde nimiam repletionem.*" Schütz. The Scholiast adds:

τῷ ἁμαρτάνοντι τοῦτο συμβαίνει, but the chorus probably alludes here especially to Agamemnon, who would be likely to be visited with regret and anguish on account of the immolation of his daughter.—ἔν θ' ὕπνῳ, in sleep even, either by breaking the hours of nocturnal repose or by the visitation of terrific dreams; "*gravissima sententia, nec tamen gravior quam vera.*"—μνησιπήμων πόνος, Schuldbewusst Missethatsangst (Humboldt), "guilt-conscious memory of of crime, guilt-remembering anguish."—σωφρονεῖν is here the subject of the verb. An infinitive thus used has commonly the article (τό) before it, but it may stand without it.—παρ' ἄκοντας, *ab invitos*: "*homines enim, divinam facinorum ultionem experti, inviti, h. e., alia nulla ratione dociles, et cum sensu doloris, quo melius caruissent, sapere discunt.*" Schutz.—ἦλθε, though coördinated in the same sentence with στάζει, is in the Aorist, to denote the frequent or general occurrence of the action, "wisdom is wont to come, or often comes." This use of the Aorist is very common among the Greeks, who employ it to designate the frequency or repetition of an action, whenever they speak of a phenomenon, that has often been observed to take place, or when they wish to announce some truth or general proposition, that is founded on individual instances of past experience. In this case the Greek, with his usual well known bent for sensuous objectivity, represents the repeated instances of his past experience instead of the universal axiom or judgment eliminated from them, and only uses the present, when the proposition has either an absolute rational value or has by experience been found to be of universal application at all times and in all places, e. g., ὁ ἄνθρωπος θνητός ἐστι. Cf. Kühner's Ausf. Gramm. § 442.

[To be continued.]

Art. VI.—THE RELATION OF THE HOLY GHOST TO THE NATURAL WORLD.

The fact that a relation of some kind exists between the Holy Spirit and the Material World ought not to be doubted by any. The difference as to nature between spirit and matter is no reason why they should be sundered either in fact or in our thinking. The visible, in every form of created existence, comes from the invisible, and rests upon it. Thought precedes action, just as action precedes the impression it makes. Spirit and body, in the mysterious constitution of man, are closely related. The form of the second is always conditioned, both minutely and generally, by the peculiar plastic type of the first. The body is the external and visible development from the soul, governed at every point by the primary forces which inhere in the latter. Mysterious as this relation may be, we cannot deny the fact of its existence. Without it man's being, in his present form, would be an impossibility. The dissolution of this relation is death, which leads to a wholly different mode or form of being from that which obtains in the present world.

An intimate relation between spirit and matter may be traced in every impression which man makes upon the hard material world around him. Man, standing in the midst of nature, is yet free and really above it.* The spirit, through the body, moulds nature, and gives completeness

* Horace Bushnell, in his able work *On Nature and the Supernatural*, regards man himself as the embodiment, in a true sense, of the *Supernatural*. On p. 43 he thus speaks: "It is no longer necessary to go hunting after marvels, apparitions, suspensions of the laws of nature, to find the supernatural; it meets us in what is least transcendent and most familiar, even in ourselves. . . . The very idea of our personality is that of a being not under the law of cause and effect, a being supernatural."

to the handiworks of the Almighty. God made all things good; * it is for man, the creature worker, to perfect them. Under him the aspect of earth changes its appearance. The soil becomes rich and mellow; the fruit becomes more abundant and delicious; even the atmasphere, which seems most defiant to the power of man, is modified by the vast changes, in the mountains and vallies, which are made to go forward from the energy of his spirit through the body.¶

The same close relation between spirit and matter is adumbrated also in the whole world of art. Thought is the mother of all mechanism. It penetrates the mysterious forces of nature, forms new combinations and thus creates and then guides new powers. Every piece of complicated machinery which now surrounds us, and at which we often stand in mute amazement, existed first in the form of an idea; and the relation of part to part, with a view to some united result, lay in the mind, concealed from observation, before it appeared in actual form. Architecture is but the continued testimony to the same general fact. The magnificent temples and gorgeous palaces, in the past, of which history informs us, as well as all the great structures in the present, both in Europe and this country, which fill us with wonder as we gaze upon them, have originated in the spirit of man—in what Socrates called his demon, and Voltaire, the devil in the body—genius.† So too, the features of the "face divine," which appear in peerless beauty on the canvas—natural and yet above nature—and the rough unmeaning stone that rises up into the form of the human figure, so complete that we almost think we hear human utterances proceeding from it, are direct creations from the spirit of the artist. This intimate relation between spirit and matter is indicated in every form of earthly being; and to ascend at once to the utmost limits of the idea, we may ask, what was the whole of the world previous to the actual going forth of the cre-

---

* Gen. 1: 31. ¶Hugh Miller, in his last and best work, *The Testimony of the Rocks*, Sixth Lecture, develops this thought very beautifully.

† M. Cousin's *Lectures on the True, Beautiful and Good.*

ational fiat, but a thought, a scheme in the Divine mind ?

Instead of regarding the difference which exists between spirit and matter as a reason for their being sundered, we are rather required to see in this fact an absolute necessity for their relation in some real sense. Matter, in the form of the world, has neither power to create itself, to give itself order and harmony in the great system of which it is a part, or to continue its being when created and harmonized, independent of a power which is not nature, but spirit. The whole physical system of the world, in connection with that of *all* worlds (pleroma), arises clearly in a self-existent Being, and hangs, with absolute necessity, upon His will every day and hour: and this Being is a Spirit.*

Our first idea of God is that of absolute unity ;† but the mind can not rest here. As God is the source of all life, He must be life itself. But life is *active* by the necessity of its own nature; hence God is active and eternally active. This activity requires an object adapted to its own nature, infinite as Himself.‡ Hence the eternal unfolding of this unity in the form of Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in essence one, but in personality three, the Son by generation from the Father, and the Spirit by procession from the Father and the Son. By virtue of their oneness in essence each of the Persons is active in the activity of the other. By way of eminence the Scriptures, it is true, assign peculiar acts to one Person, as distinguished from another ; but nowhere do they teach an absolute sundering of the three Persons in any divine act. Tritheism, which involves distinction without unity, personalities without a oneness of essence from which they spring as from an eternal, divine, yet free necessity, is never even intimated in the Revelation of the Divine being. In every act the three

---

* St. John 4 : 24. "God is a Spirit." Πνευμα here is not an attribute of the Divine Being, but His Essence, His Being itself, as distinguished from every thing carnal, or local; it expresses also His necessary *unity*, and therefore His indestructibility—the deepest ground of *reality*.

† Deut. 6 ; 4. ‡ Kurtz's Sacred History, p. 23.

Persons are active; but the order of this activity is conditioned by the order of their subsistence.* Each Person is prominent in turn in every great act. Thus creation, by way of prëeminence, is ascribed to God the Father,† redemption to God the Son,‡ and sanctification to God the Holy Ghost;‖ and yet it remains true that the three Persons, one and indissoluble in essence, are by the force of this unity, simultaneously operative in each of these great acts. In each act there is a department peculiarly appropriate to the agency of each Person.

The original and primary creation of matter, as such, is preëminently ascribed to the first Person in the Holy Trinity. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."§ Yet even here it would be manifestly improper to ignore altogether and in every sense the agency of the other two persons. While God is prevailingly prominent, He nevertheless creates *through* the Son, and *in* the Holy Ghost. The Father is the *source* of creation, the eternal Son is the *medium*, while the Holy Ghost is the general power in which the whole creation subsists as an objective fact, finds its true order, and becomes vitalized in all its parts.¶ The essential agency of the Word in the creation of the world is clearly indicated in the sacred Scriptures. "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made."†† Corresponding with this we find also the clear passage in Hebrews 11 : 3 : "Through faith we understand that the *worlds*" (τους αιωνας—a grand plural, comprehending the heaven and the earth) "were framed by the *Word* of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." The true and deep sense of the term

---

* Owen on the Holy Spirit, p. 55. † Jer. 32 : 17—Heb. 11 : 3 ‡ Matt. 1 : 21—Heb. 7 : 25. ‖ St. John 16 : 5. 1 Cor. 12 : 3. § Gen. 1 : 1. ¶ 1 Cor. 8 : 6. "To us there is but one God, the Father, *of* (εξ) whom are *all things* (τα παντα) and we in Him; one Lord Jesus Christ, *by* whom (δι' ου τα παντα) are all things, and we by him." In Rom. 11 : 36, the agency of the three Persons is evidently indicated: "*Of* Him (εξ αυτου—the Father)," and "*through* Him (δι' αυτον"—the Son), "and *to* Him, or *in* Him (εις αυτον"—the Spirit) "are all things." †† Psalm 33 : 6.

"Word," in these passages, is strikingly brought out in St. John's Gospel. "All things" (*παντα*—worlds, or heaven and earth—corresponding both with the passage in Psalms and that in Hebrews) "were made *by* Him (*δι' αυτου*); and without Him was not anything made that was made."* Thus throughout, the creation, in its primary elemental form, is regarded as coming *from* (*ἐκ*), or *by* (*υπὸ*) the Father, and *through* the Son.

The Holy Spirit is related to the creation in the same original and necessary way. This is clear from the 33d Ps. 6th v., which has already been quoted in part. "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made: *and all the host of them by the Breath of His mouth.*" By the term "*breath*"—the breath of His mouth—is meant the Holy Ghost—the inbreathing, inspiring third Person in the Trinity, whose agency was no less active than that of the other two Persons, in the original calling into being of the elemental matter of the world. The prince of prophets seemed to see this fact clearly, and the expression which he gave to his vision is at once beautiful and sublime: "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance? Who hath directed the *Spirit* of the Lord, or, being His counsellor, hast taught Him."†

This primal act of creation, in which God the Father is most prominent, had regard to matter as such, which, through it was brought into existence from nothing, or rather from the Divine will. At this stage, however, all existed in the form of chaos or confusion. "The earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep.‡ In the change of chaos into cosmos the Divine Persons seem to change their position relatively to each other and the creation, and, instead of the Father, the Holy Ghost now comes prominently into view. "The

* St. John 1: 3. † Isa. 40: 12–14. ‡ Gen. 1: 2.

Spirit of God *moved* upon the face of the waters;" and the matter which existed in a state of matted confusion by the primary creative act, began to assume order, and form, and beauty. This was also a creative act, as really and truly so as the former; but, while the one emanated from the Father prominently, the other proceeded prominently from the Holy Ghost; and while matter, as such, was the end of the one, the proper *form* of that matter was the end of the other.

The moving of the Spirit (merachepheth) over the chaos was more than a mere external, transient touching of it. The word itself carries in it the idea of a gentle, but at the same time, a powerfully pervasive motion, by which the Spirit's formative influence was made to tremble through the whole chaotic mass. The Spirit penetrated the sea of confusion, communicated heat, life and light, and deposited the living germ of "all those kinds and forms of things, which in an inconceivable variety compose its host and ornament."* Thus each part was mysteriously moved to seek its own appropriate place in the grand system of worlds. General laws and forces, emanating from the Divine Spirit, pervaded the whole, which gave to it the character of a grand and complete organism. To each particle was given an inward affinity for its own kind. The waters sought their own place. "He gathereth the waters of the sea together as a heap: He layeth up the depth in store-houses."† The dry land appeared and assumed its allotted position; while the firmament, with its sun, and moon, and stars rose into a magnificent arch over both. "By His *Spirit* He hath *garnished* the heavens, His hand hath formed the crooked *serpent*."‡ This creational act of the Spirit carried with it the idea of form to every con-

* Owen on the Holy Spirit, p. 56.

† Ps. 33 : 7. ‡ Job. 26 : 13. By which some understand the Galaxy, or Milky Way; some the constellation Draco, which to the eye represents the tortuous form of a serpent. Virgil speaks of it as "the sinuous snake," and "the resplendent snake." It was an object of worship in many portions of the heathen world.

ceivable object, from which the whole mass of inert matter unfolded itself into the order and beauty of the cosmos.

In the Holy Ghost, accordingly, we find the power of organization, from which arises the general order which pervades every department of the physical world. "This order, thus so universal, is very diversified. It will not be compressed within the narrow systems which men, founding on a limited experience, are in the way of forming, or suit itself to rigid forms of human logic. It embraces time, number, space, forms, colors, and force, as elements employed, and it blends these together in unnumbered ways. Some times its rule is simple, and at other times of great complicity. It has correspondences, analogies more or less striking, parallelisms and antagonisms. Its numbers are suited to its shapes and colors, and its forms to the position in which they are placed; and with a higher than human art, it weaves its divers colored weft and woof into figures of exquisite grace and beauty."* The natural world, thus grandly rising, by the pervasive presence of the Holy Spirit, instinct with harmony in all its parts, is made to exhibit a deep moral, as well as physical, significance.

This was a grand advance in the great creational process. The whole work was raised to a much higher stage, and made to assume a vastly more expressive character. New and higher elements were imparted to it. Light now streamed through every part of the mighty organism. The vital contact and indwelling of the Spirit gave to the natural also a spiritual meaning and mission. Form and order are spiritual, not natural, powers. The whole creation came thus to have not only an aesthetical, and moral, but also a deeply spiritual significance. From every point, and in every object, it looked up to something higher and beyond itself. In Nature itself there was lodged thus the element of the *super*-natural. It was prepared, in no small degree, to speak to the spirit of man, in regard to a spiritual world beyond the present—of the glory of God and hu-

* Rev. James McCosh's *Method of the Divine Government*, p 143–4.

man destiny.* Thus prominently through the agency of the Holy Ghost, was deeply laid the ground of the *Parable* in the constitution of the Natural World, to which Christ so frequently alluded, and the significance of which He so often drew out in such grand and beautiful form. With the permeating presence of the Holy Ghost, the world, in its grand *genesis* into form and order, could not but become a striking revelation of heaven—a many-tongued prophecy (not indeed absolutely commensurate, but still positive and clear as far as it went) of the being of God and the harmony of the heavenly world. Here lies the earthly basis of the "kingdom of God," the clear setting forth of which is the great end of the *παραβολη*. Nor dare we look upon the happy analogies which lie in the parable as in any sense arbitrary in their nature. The natural and the spiritual belong to each other, as "type and thing typified, by an inward necessity; they were linked together long before by the law of a secret affinity." Here begins every true system of Natural Philosophy and Natural Theology, for the spiritual in Nature is the key by which the portals of the palace of knowledge are opened. All natural science, to be true to itself, must be true, at the same time, to the world which it seeks to penetrate and lay open; and no science can thus be true, either when it wilfully ignores, or blindly passes by, this great fact; for if it perceive not the spiritual *from* the Spirit, in Nature, though it have ten thousand eyes, it can never see fully either the true or the beautiful, as it lies in the system of creation. From the bosom of this spiritual power the *whole* of Nature adumbrates, at every point, the supernatural and divine. Each object, from the greatest to the most insignificant, becomes typical and prophetic.† Thus "the heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night shew-

* William Lee *On Inspiration of the Scriptures*, p. 22.

† Richard Chenevix Trench, in his book on *The Parables*, which is deservedly popular both in Europe and this country, after showing that the analogies implied by the parable were not only *illustrative* of spiritual truth, &c.,

eth knowledge."‡ Even the darkness is made the medium of light and wisdom. Thus, too, "the mountains skip like rams, and the little hills like lambs."‖ And prophecy says, "The mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands."§

There is evidently more than mere beautiful poetry in all this; it is the spiritual soul of Nature struggling from her inmost depths to give outward expression to her great life. And is not all this confirmed in the still higher and clearer revelation of the New Testament? "For the *invisible things*, (*τα ἀόρατα*) of Him from the creation of the world are *clearly seen* (*καθορατᾶι*), being *understood*, or *perceived* (*νοούμενα*) by the *things that are made* (*τοῖς ποιημάσι*), even His eternal power and Godhead."¶ The *precise* extent of this revelation may indeed be a matter of controversy; yet all must agree that its general effect was to leave man without

---

says, p. 18–19: "Their power lies deeper than this, in the harmony unconsciously felt by all men, and by deeper minds continually recognized and plainly perceived, between the natural and the spiritual worlds, so that analogies from the first are felt to be something more than illustrations, happily but yet arbitrarily chosen. They are arguments, and may be alleged as witnesses; the world of nature being throughout a witness for the world of spirit, proceeding from the same hand, growing out of the same root, and being constituted for that very end. All lovers of truth readily acknowledge these mysterious harmonies, and the force of argument derived from them. To them the things on earth are copies of the things in heaven. They know that the earthly tabernacle is made after the pattern of things seen in the mount, (Ex. xxv. 40; 1 Chron. xxviii: 11, 12; and the question suggested by the Angel in Milton is often forced upon their meditations,—

"What if earth
Be but the shadow of heaven and things therein
Each to other like, more than on earth is thought?"

‡ Ps. 19: 1, 2. ‖ Ps. 114: 4. § Isa. 55: 12. ¶ Rom. 1: 20; with which may also be compared Acts 14: 15, &c., 17: 23, &c. In regard to the first passage Calvin remarks: "Deus per se invisibilis est, sed quia elucet ejus majestas in operibus et creaturis universis, debuerunt illico homines agnascere, nam artificem suum porspicue dedarant." Bengel, in his *Gnomon of the N. T.*, distinguishes between *θειοτης* et *θεοτης*, the first signifying *divinity*, the latter *Godhead*. Divinity connected with *power* (*δυναμις*)—God's perfection in *being* and *acting*, is regarded as the peculiar burden of revelation in the work of creation.

excuse. This is clearly the moral of the whole verse: "So that they" (the heathen) "are without excuse." The force of this will be fully perceived, if, with this revealing power of Nature through the Holy Ghost, we connect the deeper consciousness of spiritual things in man, than that which strictly belongs to his individuality, which has been communicated to him in the same way, and by the same Spirit.* Between the world within and the world without there was a very intimate relation. Man was not only qualified subjectively to meet the spiritual revelation that stood out objectively in the World of Nature, but he was also mysteriously drawn to it by the supernatural tendencies of his own being. Thus, through the creational agency of the Holy Ghost, a moral, intelligent and spiritual character was given to the whole system of Creation, making it to mirror, in a high degree, both the divinity of its origin and the spiritual as well as natural and moral mission with which it was invested.

What interval of time separated between the creation of matter as such, under its elemental, chaotic form, and the creation of form and order, with all their cosmical relations and aesthetical, moral and spiritual bearings, we are not concerned now particularly to inquire into. Whether this was brief or extended, a minute or an age, is immaterial to the present subject; only care should be taken to avoid the idea of separate acts and separate creations. Whatever length of time, for the human mind, may hold between the two effects, these effects grow from one and the same act—the one is but the proper form of the other. It is not possible, in any ideal way, to separate here abstractly between matter and form. This were to split the creation by a dualistic wedge, which would destroy all its meaning. Creation was a true historical act—a *genesis*, carrying in it the same divine act from stage to stage—through which God revealed Himself gradually, first in the rude elemental state of matter, then through the Holy Ghost, in its or-

* Rom. 2: 14–16.

ganization, form and order, until the whole stood forth as the finished work of the Holy Trinity, with the principle of unity pervading it throughout; so that while nature abounds with the types of three divine personalities, its organic oneness, being equally omnipresent to the observant mind, proclaims also the essential unity of these personalities in One God. In the beginning of this creational process, as also in the New or spiritual Creation, God the Father was the most prominent Person—in the completing of it, as also in the spiritual creation, God the Holy Ghost was the most prominent—and both proceeded through the same creative medium, God the Son. Thus, by the Holy Ghost, was concluded, completed and perfected, in the natural world, what had been commenced by the Father.*

But just as we see creation rising and approximating its ultimate perfection, so we behold the Divine Spirit coming forward conspicuously in the grand scene. In man it culminates and comes to its highest moral and spiritual meaning. He is its lord, and to his power it is subjected. Its whole significance centres in his consciousness, and thence it is reflected upon every object around him. Strange that unbelievers, who extol Nature as the all-sufficient revelation from God, and of God, should be found detracting man's dignity in the creation, and thus actually confusing for themselves the rays of light and knowledge, by destroying the harmony of God's works, which it would otherwise pour upon them.† But this is only another evidence of

* Owen on the Holy Spirit, p. 55. † "The school of infidelity represented by Bolingbroke, and, in at least his earlier writings, by Soame Jenyns, and which, in a modified form, attained to much popularity through Pope's famous 'Essay,' assigned to man a comparatively inconsiderable space in the system of the universe. It regarded him as a single link in a chain of mutual dependency,—a chain which would be no longer an entire, but a broken one, were he to be struck out of it, but as thus more important from his position than from his nature or his powers. You will remember that one of the sections of Pope's first epistle to his 'good St. John" is avowedly devoted to show what he terms the 'absurdity of man's supposing himself the final cause of creation;' and though this great master of condensed and brilliant point is now less read than he was in the days of our grandfathers, you will all remember the elegant stanzas in which he states the usual claims of the

the chaos of the mind itself when the faith, which it is the office of the Spirit to form, is absent, which, in a child-like disposition, takes God at His word.

In the creation of man—the finishing wonder of the whole work—a copy of the Trinity in his distinction into body, soul and spirit, the peculiar agency of the Holy Ghost comes still more fully and clearly to light. But here, also, the first Person in the Godhead is most prominent in the primary stage of the act. "And God said, Let us make man in our own image, and after our own likeness."* "The natural aspects of man's being are given in the 2nd chapter and 7th verse: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." As to his body he was made of the "dust of the ground;" not only, as some suppose, to show its mean origin, and thus to teach him humility; but, first and prominently, that he might thus be organically related to the whole system of nature below him, that he might truly be its prophet and lord; and, second, that he might bear about with him continually the sure signs of his mortality as to the present stage of human being, and a token of a higher destiny in the future world. While man is thus an organic part of the material world—related to it as the head is to the body—he is, by necessity, subject to all its manifold changes. Dust or sand—composing his body, which is constantly, by its own nature, changing the relation of its

---

species only to ridicule. It is humau pride personified that he represents as exclaiming,"—

> "For me kind Nature wakes her genial power,
> Suckles each herb, and spreads out every flower,
> Annual for me the grape, the rose, renew
> The juice nectarious and the balmy dew:
> For me the mine a thousand treasures brings;
> For me health gushes from a thousand springs;
> Seas roll to waft me, suns to light me rise;
> My footstool earth, my canopy the skies."
>
> Testimony of the Rocks, p. 224.

* Gen. 1: 26.

particles to each other, is the most impressive type that could be selected vividly to set forth the idea of disintegration, decay and death. This was man's nature prior to sin, which made it look with a steady, though not a gloomy, necessity, to the point of its change. While it is true that the words "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return,"* were uttered after the entrance of sin, and doubtless looked primarily to sin, yet, pointing as they did to the peculiar nature of man's physical constitution, made of dust, and then referring to dust as the final element into which it should again be resolved, we cannot but regard them as comprehending the more general and natural, as well as the more special and moral, causes of death. The last clause of the sentence seems to grow by a natural necessity out of the first: because thou *art* dust, therefore thou must again *return* to dust. In this dust-constitution lies the general cause of death. Take this in connection with the clear evidences, furnished by Geology, that death existed in the world previous, long previous to the creation of man, and we shall find it very difficult, nay, impossible, to ignore the natural cause of death. Yet it is equally impossible to overlook, at the same time, the more specific cause, as this lies in the power of sin. "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."† "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."‡ That sin and death are here related as cause and effect, is too self-evident to require proof. But does this particular cause necessarily rule out the cause which is general and which so plainly lies in the constitution of nature itself? We think not. Various theories have been devised, by which to harmonize the two apparently antagonizing facts. Dr. J. Pye Smith, admitting the mortality in the physical organization of man, contended that, by means unknown to the human mind, he would have been exempted from the law of progress towards dissolution, had he maintained his

* Gen. 3: 19. † Gen. 2: 17. ‡ Rom. 5: 12.

primevil innocence. Jeremy Taylor says, "that the death which God threatened to Adam, and which passed upon his posterity, is not the going out of this world, but the manner of going." It is easily conceived that the death which was in the world previous to sin, and which would doubtless have passed upon all men even had they remained in their innocence, was a very different death, both in kind and manner, from that which was subsequently the result directly of transgression. The first was natural, easy and calm, entirely separated from the displeasure and curse of God; while the second is unnatural, painful and distressing. In the latter sense sin alone is the cause of death; in the former the cause is anterior to the fall, embedded, for wise purposes, and doubtless gracious purposes also, in the physical constitution of man itself.

The nature of man carried in it the necessity of rising to a higher sphere of being than the present world in order fully to develop its original powers. The purpose to raise man to this higher sphere was also clearly in the mind of God. Heaven was not constituted as the ultimate home of man only after his removal from the present world was made necessary by sin. It lay in the original purpose of God. But in order to rise to this home it would have been necessary for man to undergo a great change in the nature of his being, fitting him for this higher order of life. This change would have been death—a ceasing to exist in one state and one form, and a beginning to exist in another state and another form. In this sense even Enoch and Elijah died, although it is said of them that they did not taste death, i. e., the death produced by sin; for no one would suppose that their bodies were taken to heaven in precisely the same form as that in which they existed on earth. This change, whatever it might be (and of its minute nature we can, of course, know very little) though not the same thing with death resulting from sin, being entirely destitute of the moral elements which enter into and compose it, would nevertheless, as a medium, have doubtless led to the same high end, unless, indeed, we imagine,

as many do, that through a sinful experience, we should become qualified for a still higher state of glory.* For the difference would certainly not result from the fact, that in the latter case we become vitally connected with Christ, and that in the former we should not have come into such relationship. This latter supposition is altogether gratuitous; for, whether we look to the nature of man, or to the peculiar primary constitution of the second Person in the Holy Trinity, we must conclude, that such a union would have been effected, though manifestly under very different form and circumstances. The material ground of humility, thus placed by an original act of creation, in the constitution of man, would therefore, as in the case of all true humility, have involved in it ascending forces, by which he would have risen to a higher order of nature and a more glorious form of being.

Just as in nature generally, so in the body of man in particular, its peculiar organization and form result directly from the agency of the Holy Ghost. In the Psalm in which David, overwhelmed with wonder in view of the immensity of God, asked—"Whither shall I go from thy *Spirit*," he said, further on, "Thou hast possessed my reins: thou hast covered me in my mother's womb. I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well. My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of

* If any such benefit could legitimately arise from the existence of sin as such, this would certainly go very far towards the justification of its entrance and continuance. Sin—which in its nature is the direct negation of all good—can of course have no such virtue; and whatever good man may attain to through it, will be attained to in spite of it, by the still deeper, stronger and more abounding grace of God through Jesus Christ. Rom. 5: 15–21. Sin can only destroy, and the grace of God in Christ only can save; so that sin, whatever service it may be made to render the Christian life by the overruling power of God, must still only be execrated and abhored.

them."* This finishing or *fashioning*, in the way of giving form and order to the various parts of the human body, so that, when man surveys himself, he must feel that he is "fearfully and wonderfully made"—"made a little lower than the angels,"** was the peculiar work of the Holy Spirit.

But the complete being of man involves higher and finer material than the "dust of the ground." While from below he takes his body, from above he receives his *life*. "God breathed into his nostrils the *breath of life;* and man became a *living* soul."† In this higher region of man's being the Holy Ghost—though always in perfect unison with the other two persons—is specially prominent. The Breath of God, and the Spirit of God, are the same thing. The creation of both body and soul is sometimes ascribed to the Holy Spirit; as for instance, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the Breath of the Almighty hath given me life."‡ If the Spirit was prominent in the completing touches of the physical part of man's nature, making it to stand out in bold and wonderful contrast with the inanimate dust from which it was taken as we have already seen; this relation was still more direct and intimate to his inner life. This life was a part of the Spirit's self—a spiritual, immaterial, simple principle—the *Breath* of God. Thus, by the original creation already, the body was, in a deep sense, "the temple of the Holy Ghost."§ Christianity seeks, in this respect, only to restore, may be in fuller measure, what man originally possessed, but lost through the Fall. As by it the Holy Ghost is again brought back into the body, as the principle of its true and higher life—

---

* Ps. 139: 7, 13–16. ** Ps. 8: 5. Heb. 2: 7, 8, 9.

† Lic. K. A. Kahnis, in his *Lehre Vom Heiligen Geiste*, which is certainly not free from the charge of strong Pantheistic tendency, says, p. 17: "In allen Menschen waltet also der Geist Gottes als Geist des Lebens (1 Mos. 6, 3. 4 Mos. 27, 16), damit der Mensch nicht vom Fleische beherrscht (1 Mos. 6: 3.) als Geist sich auf sein Urbild zurück beziehe, sein Geist also Träger eines guten Geistes werde."

‡ Job 33: 4. § 1 Cor. 6: 19.

a life altogether natural in the normal state of man—the inference is necessary, that the human body was, at the first, His earthly temple. God breathed *into* him the breath of *life;* and he became a *living soul.*

The *soul* of man, though the immediate result of the *divine breath* breathed into him, which is the *Spirit* of God, is yet not to be pantheistically confounded with the Spirit, or in any way to be regarded as identical. Man is thereby not the Spirit—though spiritual—nor is the Spirit thereby man. Linked thus, in the innermost depths of his nature, with the Holy Ghost, and the spiritual world, man is yet specifically different from this divine Person, but qualified thereby, in a high degree, for all His gifts.* "The soul is the unity of the spirit and body, the individual life and finiteness of the Spirit."† In the soul arise individuality and personality; and though it may not be absolutely immortal in itself considered, (as this belongs to God alone,‡ and is His special gift through Jesus Christ,§ it is still capable of existing independent of the body. Here opens the whole inner world of consciousness, in its relation to self (ego), the physical world with all its moral and aesthetical forces, in the midst of which man lives, and the spiritual world which reigns above him. United organically, on the one side, through his body, to the whole of natural existence beneath him, he is no less really united, on the other, through his spirit, with the whole of spiritual being above him—both centering and uniting in the soul. What an extended range of thought and feeling! What various forces, from every direction, converge in man! What a condensed fulness of mysterious elements of thought is thus made to crowd his consciousness! No wonder that

* In this fact lies the natural basis of inspiration as an extraordinary gift. The theory of Mr. Morell, and others, who make inspiration to consist in an exalted state of the intuitional faculties, is not wholly in error, however far short it may come of the full truth. While inspiration is *super*natural, it is not *un*natural, the way, in nature, being prepared for it already in the original creation, by the Holy Ghost.

† Nitzsch's System of Christ. Doct., p. 202. ‡ 1 Tim. 6; 13—16. § 2 Tim. 1: 10. Comp. Gen. 3; 22, 23.

he should be rated, in the wonderous nature of his being, as well as in his central position in the complicated web of existence, as a *little* lower than the angels. All this was effected prominently through the agency of the Holy Ghost—the Breath in-breathed into man's being, whereby, amid all the ten thousand strong and far-reaching relations he sustained both to existence above, beneath and around him, he yet rose up into a self-hood more free and perfect than that perhaps of any other creature of God.

Nor does the agency of the Holy Ghost with man stop here. Moral rectitude; conformity to God in disposition and spirit; holiness and spiritual knowledge, are direct fruits of the indwelling creative Spirit. These are all comprehended in the *image*, or *similitude* in which he was created.* Here the Spirit indicates man's true destiny, which is to know Him of whom, and by whom he is,† to love himself and all his fellow men, and to become blessed in the communion of God, saints and angels. Since the fall it is the peculiar office of the Holy Ghost to restore to the moral consciousness of man the full force of all this; and in this fact His prominent agency in its original gift is fully established.‡ The peculiar relation of the Spirit to the New Creation, which now is made to stand out in broad contrast with the Old, is at every point confirmatory of the truth now presented. The New Creation originated in the Father, was brought to its elementary existence in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost it came to full, living, organized form, in the bosom of the old creation, in order that the whole world of being, which had fallen by sin, might again be restored to its true character and position. The creation of the Church by the Spirit amid the wonders of Pentecost, was not a creation out of nothing, but in Christ, and through Christ—the organization and form-giving of His generic life and works, so that it became "His Body" and was made to carry with it, and in

---

* Gen. 1: 27. James 3: 9. † Acts 17: 27. John 17: 3. ‡ St. John 8; 6. 2 Cor. 3: 18.

it the "fulness of Him which filleth all in all."* And in all the practical individual, as well as collective detail of the Christian life, the Holy Ghost, in the New Testament, is set forth as the Creator of form and order, as the Inspirer, the Finisher, the Sanctifier.

The original relation of the Holy Ghost to the Natural World has at no point in its long history ceased to exist, any more than the relation of the Father and Son. The world's preservation, inasmuch as it requires the active energy of the same divine powers as those by which it was first called into being and formed, must be regarded in the light of a continued act of creation. Preservation is the legitimate history, from day to day, and year to year, of creation; which involves the same intimate relation of the Trinity at every point. Specially prominent, however, in this work, is the Holy Spirit, for the obvious reason, that preservation has more direct regard to the form and order, or harmony of the world, than to the matter of which it is composed. The ispired utterance in reference to the continued dependence of nature, in every view, but especially in its formal character, upon the Divine presence under its distinctive form, is both pointed and beautiful. "Thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust. Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth."† The peculiar form of nature is the direct creation of the Holy Ghost, and He preserves what He originally produced. The regular order of the planets; the stated return of the seasons; the harmony of the whole of animate and inanimate nature,—all depends prominently upon the continued inherent presence of the Holy Spirit, who at the first moved over chaos and formed it into cosmos. Should the Spirit, at any time, abandon the great structure of the universe, we have reason to believe that its order would at once be broken, and that throughout the immensity of space, worlds would dash on worlds, and systems on systems, until all would

---

* Eph. 1: 22, 23. Comp. 4: 11–16. † Ps. 104: 29, 30.

be reduced again to the dark confusion from which they were made to arise.

True, nature—to be nature—must have a self-hood—a *proprium*—a power of self-subsistence, in some real sense; otherwise it would not be a nature. But we can well see how easily, at this point, we may step over from the green and living earth, enshrining the omnipotent agency of the Divine Being, into the bleak regions of Atheism, and conceive or dream of a world without God. Whether Prof. Taylor Lewis, in his very learned and generally clear work, on the *Bible and Science*, or *The World Problem*, does not strongly tend in this direction, will at least admit of some little fear.* He does not, indeed, sever God from His works, in so many words, but does he not make His relation to them to be of such an outside and distant character, as to induce the conclusion that, if it be nothing *more*, it need not even be this? The true self-hood of nature implies just as little power to continue its existence from itself, as to begin its existence from nothing; for beyond the Divine Preserving hand nothing exists just as truly as it does beyond His creative hand. The Professor very frankly acknowledges the difficulty of the position to which his theory leads him, and seeks to find a solution of it in the "higher laws of thinking." But whether a door of escape can be found here is at least very doubtful. If the theory should happen to involve a *contradiction* (which it certainly would do in case it were carried to the point of

* "We must, in some way," says the Professor, "have a self-subsistence in nature, as something given to nature, and which God could give to nature, whether we can explain the method and the rationale of it or not. There may be this self-hood, and yet God the supporting ground, as he is the supporting ground even of spirit. We may not be able to explain the difference between this supporting ground and a constant immediate energizing in every act of nature, but such difference there must be, whether we can see it, and understand it, or not. The proof is in the higher laws of thinking, we say again. There must be a nature, or we fall into a pantheism where the moral and physical both perish. But a nature, as such, can be thought in no other way. Therefore there *is* a nature having a life of its own, a subsistence of its own, imparted to it,—a nature in some true sense going of itself,—and, therefore, having both growth and deterioration." pp. 342–3.

self-being, in the strict sense, then, plainly, the *higher laws of thinking*, instead of involving it as a necessity, to be adhered to even when all ability to explain it fails, would, in the same necessary way, exclude it, whatever extraneous evidence there might be to sustain it. The self-hood of nature does not, in the consciousness of man, require an abstract separation of the Divine. Mr. Lewis acknowledges this by allowing God to be its "ground," as He is also the ground of Spirit. But this, in his mind, is merely outward, an outward contact, conceived as a necessity whereby to avoid contradiction on the one hand, and Pantheism on the other. If, however, the dependence of the world upon God as its *ground* does not militate against its proper self-hood, then we cannot see why a maintenance of it by His pervasive presence, agreeably to His attribute of omnipresence, should do this: and to avoid the heresy of Pantheism, which makes God and the world *identical*, it is surely not necessary to launch into the opposite heresy of Atheism, which, to say the least, is equally abhorrent and dangerous. The truth here, as elsewhere, lies *in media*. God is *in* nature really, but is specifically different from nature; He pervades it in every department, but is never, to any degree, or in any sense, one with it. Nature is nature—God is God, however close and necessary the relation which holds between them. Heat, though it permeate every particle of the iron, is yet not the iron. Here is the world's true self-hood, entirely unmixed with divinity; and here is divinity entirely unmixed with the world, while the relation between the two is, at the same time, most inward and real. Thus the world is preserved in all its parts from day to day, both in matter and form, by the united agency of the Trinity, *in* it, and not *out* of it, and not by any self-power resting mechanically on God as its ground.

The same facts hold also in the human world, which carries in it, in a still higher sense, the idea of self-hood. The continuance of the race from age to age, in its original form, physically and intellectually, is peculiarly the work of the Holy Ghost. The law of generation, and the order

of thought result directly from His power, and are maintained by His presence; and the relation between subjective thinking and objective thought, between finite conceptions and infinite ideals, depends absolutely upon His immanent presence and continued inspiring agency in the soul of man.* But we cannot now tarry at this point.

He reigns prominently, also, in history. If this is regarded as the proper on-going of the world under its cosmical conditions and relations, we can easily see how central and necessary is the agency of the Holy Spirit in it. Who but He has preserved the moral and governmental harmony of the world since its origin, with all the abnormal forces of the fall to the contrary? Who but He has renewed its wasting energies and maintained it in the vigor of a perennial youth and beauty? Who but He has continued that admirable adjustment of power throughout the nations, which has been the basis of peace, brotherhood and prosperity?—And who but He, when the original forces of chaos have momentarily broken through the laws of order, and anarchy, tyranny and oppression have proudly asserted their right to reign over the world, has qualified the little minority to chastise the impudence, correct the evil and restore the harmony? The world has been led forward, in its progressive development, by the principle of *might*, and in the Holy Ghost, might is right—not, in-

---

* Acts 17: 28. Ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν, καὶ κινούμεθα, καί ἐσμεν ὡς καὶ τινες τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν εἰρήκασι· Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμεν. On this verse Olshausen, in his *Commentary*, Vol. IV. p. 565, says: "This nearness of God, even to the creature that is estranged from him, the Apostle describes in a very impressive manner. The divine Being is plainly with him the immanent ground of all creatures, in some measure the sea of life, in which they all move. Fear of a pantheistic view of the world has led men, though without any reason, to refine upon the expression, ἐν αὐτῷ, and to understand it in the sense of 'by him.' The whole of the sacred Scriptures exhibits, as Paul does here, one God who is inwardly near to man; yea, whose eternal word speaks in the bottom of his heart." Cyprian says: "We are in the Father, we live in the Son, and have motion and make progress in the Holy Ghost." Ἐν, says Bengel, "expresses the most efficacious presence flowing from the most intimate tie of connection."

deed, the might of the world's cohorts, as such, but the underlying might resulting from the Spirit's omnipotence. "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong;"† and history itself has embalmed the truth, that it is "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit," ‡ that being is continued and that form and order, righteousness and peace are upheld and promoted in the earth. The agency of the Holy Spirit in the world, though quiet as the gentle breeze that softly steals among the rustling leaves and pendent flowers, or tenderly tosses to and fro the golden locks that cluster in beauty round the brow of the little maiden, is nevertheless, connected with Divine Providence, a present power, vastly greater than the heaving earthquake, more consuming than the raging fire, and more terrible than any storm that has ever swept over sea or land. He that mysteriously brooded over the elemental chaos of the world, and by His indwelling presence developed its magnificent form, and filled it with harmony, will continue His work, according to the divine promise, until the whole shall result in a new heaven and a new earth; when all abnormal forces shall be completely crushed, and righteousness shall reign with an undisputed right and illimitable sway.

D. G.

† Ec. 9: 11. ‡ Zech. 4: 6.

ART. VII.—SLAVERY AND THE BIBLE.

THE ORIGIN OF SLAVERY.

The Bible, which we acknowledge as the infallible source and supreme rule in matters of religion and morals, commences with the highest and noblest view of man by representing him as the bearer of the image of God and placing him at the head of the whole creation. The divine image, whatever it may be besides, necessarily implies the idea of personality, that is reason and will, or intelligence and freedom. By these inestimable gifts man is far elevated above the brute, reflects the glory of his Maker, and is capable of communion with Him.

With this primitive conception and condition of man slavery or involuntary and perpetual servitude is incompatible. It has no place in paradise. God created man male and female, and thus instituted marriage and the family relation before the fall, but not slavery. The only slave then could have been Eve, but she was equally the bearer of the divine image and the loving and beloved partner of Adam. In the language of a distinguished English commentator, "the woman was made of a rib out of the side of man; not made out of his head, to top him—not out of his feet, to be trampled upon by him—but out of his side, to be equal with him—from under his arm, to be protected—and from near his heart to be beloved."

But man fell from his original state by the abuse of his freedom in an act of disobedience, and was consequently driven from paradise. Sin is the first and worst kind of slavery, and the fruitful source of every other intellectual, moral, and physical degradation. In this sense every sinner is a slave to his own appetites and passions, and can only attain to true freedom by the Christian salvation. Hence the Saviour says: "Whosoever committeth sin is the serv-

ant (*doulos*, slave) of sin.... If the Son shall make you free, ye shall he free indeed." (John viii. 34–36.)

Slavery then takes its rise in sin, and more particularly in war and the law of brute force. Lust of power, avarice and cruelty were the original motives, kidnapping, conquest in war, and purchase by money were the original methods, of depriving men of their personal freedom and degrading them to mere instruments for the selfish ends of others.

But when the institution was once generally introduced, most slaves were born such and were innocently inherited like any other kind of property. Slaveholding became an undisputed right of every freeman and was maintained and propagated as an essential part of the family among all the ancient nations. In many cases also freemen voluntarily sold themselves into slavery from extreme poverty, or lost their freedom in consequence of crime.

THE CURSE OF NOAH.

Slavery, like despotism, war, and all kinds of oppression, existed no doubt long before the deluge, which was sent upon the earth because it was "filled with violence" (Gen. vi. 11). But it is not expressly mentioned till after the flood, in the remarkable prophecy of Noah, uttered more than four thousand years ago and reaching in its fulfilment, or at least in its applicability, even to our time and country. Bishop Newton, in his "Dissertations on the Prophecies," calls it "the history of the world in epitome." It is recorded in Genesis ix. 25–27, and in its metrical form according to the Hebrew reads as follows:

25. "Cursed be Canaan;
A servant of servants* shall he be unto his brethren.

26. Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem;
And Canaan shall be a servant unto them.

27. God shall enlarge Japheth,

---

* עֶבֶד עֲבָדִים, *ebhed abhadim*, i. e., the meanest or lowest of servants; a Hebrew form of intensifying the idea, as in the expressions *king of kings*, *holy of holies*, *song of songs*.

> And he (Japheth) shall dwell in the tents of Shem ;
> And Canaan shall be a servant unto them."†

Noah, a preacher of righteousness before the flood, speaks here as a far-seeing inspired prophet to the new world after the flood. He pronounces a curse thrice repeated upon one of his grandsons, and a blessing upon two of his sons, yet with regard not so much to their individual as their representative character, and looking to the future posterity of the three patriarchs of the human family. Ham, the father of Canaan, represents the idolatrous and servile races; Shem, the Israelites who worshipped Jehovah, the only true and living God; Japheth, those gentiles, who by their contact with Shem were brought to a knowledge of the true religion. The curse was occasioned by gross indecency and profane irreverence to the aged Noah. It was inflicted upon Canaan, the youngest of the four sons of Ham, either because he was, according to an ancient Jewish tradition, the real offender, and Ham merely the reporter of the fact, or more probably because he made sport of his grandfather's shame when seen and revealed by Ham to his brothers, and was the principal heir of the irreverence and impiety of his father. But Ham was also punished in his son who was most like him, as he had sinned against his father.* The whole posterity of Canaan was included in the curse because of their vices and wickedness (Levit. xviii. 24, 25), which God foresaw, yet after all with a merciful design as to their ultimate destiny.

---

† עֶבֶד לָמוֹ, *ebhed lamo, a servant to them*, i. e., either to Shem and his posterity (as Hengstenberg takes it), or better to both Shem and Japheth which agrees best with "*unto his brethren*" v. 25. The English version, Luther and many others translate in v. 26. and 27. "*his* (Shem's) servant," and Ewald (Hebrew Grammar p. 459) asserts that *amo* may sometimes denote the singular, referring to Ps. xi. 7 ; Job xxii. 2 ; Deut. xxxii, 2 and Is. xl. 15. But Hengstenberg (in the second German edition of his Christology of the O. T. I. 32) maintains that *amo*, like *am*, of which it is only a fuller poetical form, signifies always the plural.

* Some manuscripts of the Septuagint or Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures read "*Ham*" for *Canaan*, and the Arabic version "*the father of Canaan*," in the three verses of this prophecy.

The malediction of Noah was first fulfilled, on a large national scale, about eight hundred years after its delivery, when the Israelites, the favorite descendants of Shem, subdued the Canaanites, under the leadership of Joshua and under divine direction, and made some of their tribes "bondmen and hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of God" (Joshua ix. 23–27). It was further fulfilled, when Solomon subdued the scattered remnants of those tribes (1 Kings ix. 20, 21; 2 Chron. viii. 7–9). Thus Canaan came under the rod of Shem. But he was also to be a servant to Japheth ("unto his *brethren*," v. 25, "unto *them*," v. 26 and 27). Under this view the prediction was realized in the successive dominion of the Persians, Greeks, and Romans, all descendants of Japheth, over the Phenicians and Carthaginians, who belong to the posterity of Canaan. The blessing of Noah was likewise strikingly fulfilled in the subsequent course of history reaching down to the introduction of Christianity. Shem was the bearer of the true religion before Christ. Japheth dwelled in the tents of Shem, literally, by conquering his territory under the Greeks and Romans, and spiritually, by the conversion of his vast posterity to the Christian religion which proceeded from the bosom of Shem. It is true here in the highest sense that the conquered gave laws to the conquerors.

But in point of fact both the curse and the blessing of Noah extend still further and justify a wider historical application. The curse of involuntary servitude, which in the text is confined to the youngest son of Canaan because of his close contact with the Israelites, has affected nearly the whole of the posterity of Ham, or those unfortunate African races which for many centuries have groaned and are still groaning under the despotic rule of the Romans, the Saracens, the Turks, and even those Christian nations who engaged in the iniquity of the African slave trade. Whether we connect it with this ancient prophecy or not, it is simply a fact which no one can deny, that the negro to this day is a servant of servants in our own midst. Japheth, on the other hand, the progenitor of half the human

race, who possesses a part of Asia and the whole of Europe, is still extending his posterity and territory in the westward course of empire, and holds Ham in bondage far away from his original home and final destination.

Slavery then is represented from the start as a punishment and a curse and is continued as such from generation to generation for these four thousand years, falling with special severity upon the African race, and involving the innocent with the guilty. A dark veil still hangs over this dispensation of Providence, which will be lifted only by the future pages of history. God alone, in his infinite wisdom and mercy, can and will settle the negro question by turning even a curse into a blessing and by overruling the wrath of man for his own glory. All his punishments have a disciplinary object and remedial character. The prophecy of Noah, it is true, has no comfort for poor Canaan, and no blessing for Ham. But David already looked forward to the time when "Ethiopia shall stretch out her hands unto God" (Ps. lxviii. 31). The new dispensation gives us more light and hope and solves the mysteries of the old. The Gospel of Christ who praised the faith of a daughter of Canaan (Matth. xv. 28) and who died for all races, classes and conditions of man, authorizes us to look forward to the ultimate salvation of the entire posterity of Ham through the agency of Japheth and the severe but wholesome discipline of slavery. As Japheth dwelled in the eastern tents of Shem and was converted to his faith, so we may say that Ham dwells in the western tents of Japheth and is trained in America for his final deliverance from the ancient curse of bondage by the slow but sure operation of Christianity both upon him and his master, and for a noble mission to the entire mysterious continent of Africa.

PATRIARCHAL SLAVERY.

We next meet slavery as an established domestic institution among the patriarchs of the Jewish nation, as will appear from the following passages:

Gen. xii. 16: "And Abram had sheep, and oxen, and he-asses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and she-asses and camels."

Gen. xiv. 14: "And when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen."

Gen. xvii. 23: "And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house (slaves by birth), and all that were bought with his money (slaves by purchase), every male among the men of Abraham's house; and circumcised the flesh of their fore-skin in the selfsame day, as God had said unto him."

Gen. xx. 14: "And Abimelech took sheep, and oxen, and men-servants, and women-servants, and gave them unto Abraham, and restored him Sarah his wife."

Gen. xxiv. 35: "And the Lord hath blessed my master (Abraham) greatly: and he is become great: and he hath given him flocks, and herds, and silver, and gold, and men-servants and maid-servants, and camels, and asses."

Gen. xxvi. 14: "He (Isaac) had possession of flocks, and possession of herds, and great store of servants: and the Philistines envied him."

Gen. xxx. 43: "And the man (Jacob) increased exceedingly, and had much cattle, and maid-servants, and men-servants, and camels, and asses."

Gen. xxxii. 5: "And I (Jacob) have oxen, and asses, flocks, and men-servants, and women-servants."

Compare Job i. 3: "His substance also was seven thousand sheep, and three thousand camels, and five hundred yoke of oxen, and five hundred she-asses, and a very great household," (literally: very many servants; German: *grosse Dienerschaft.*)

The Hebrew term employed here and throughout the Old Testament generally for servants,* is not necessarily degrading, like our *slave;* on the contrary *ebhed* means originally *laborer*, *worker*, and work was no disgrace among a people whose kings and prophets were called from the flock and the plough; yea, it is used in innumerable passages in the most honorable sense and applied to messengers of kings, to angels, to Moses, the prophets and the highest officers of the theocracy, in their relation to God. But in its usual literal sense it is universally understood to mean

---

* עֶבֶד, *ebhed* (from the verb עָבַד, *abhad*, first *to labor;* then *to serve*, either man or God), plural עֲבָדִים, *abhadim*, for male servants; and שִׁפְחָה, *shiphcha*, plural שִׁפְחוֹת, *shephachoth*, or אָמָה, *amah*, and אֲמָהוֹת, *amahoth*, for female servants. The latter terms express the close connection with the family.

bond servants in distinction from *hired* or voluntary servants, who were comparatively rare among ancient nations and are but seldom mentioned in the Old Testament.* The slaves here spoken of were either born in the house (called *jelide baiith*) or purchased by money (*miknath cheseph*, Gen. xvii. 23), and owned in large numbers by the patriarchs and the patriarchal Job without any sense of guilt or impropriety on their side, and without a mark of disapprobation on the side of God. Their usual enumeration and collocation with sheep, oxen, asses and camels, although less degrading than Aristotle's definition of a slave as a "living tool," or "animated possession,"† is very offensive to our modern ear and to our Christian taste, and shows the difference between the Old Testament and the New, where they are never mentioned in such connection. In one passage the servants are even put between the he-asses and the she-asses, in another between the cattle and the camels, and in a third between the gold and the camels.

But we have no right at all to infer from this fact that the patriarchs regarded and treated their servants no better than their favorite animals. Their whole character and religion justifies the opposite conclusion. They bought, but, as far as the record goes, they never sold any of their slaves. There is no trace of a slave traffic in the Old Testament. The patriarchal servitude was free from the low mercenary aspect, the spirit of caste and the harsh treatment, which characterized the same institution among all the heathen nations. It was of a purely domestic character and tempered by kindness, benevolence and a sense of moral and religious equality before God. This appears from the high

---

* The Hebrew term for *hired* servant is שָׂכִיר, Ex. xii. 45 compared with 44; xxii. 14; Levit. xix. 13; Deut. xxiv. 14; Job. vii. 2. Josephus (Antiquities iv. 8, 38) explains the Jewish law as to hired servants thus: "Let it be always remembered, that we are not to defraud a poor man of his wages, as being sensible that God has allotted that wages to him instead of land and other possessions; nay, this payment is not at all to be delayed, but to be made that very day, since God is not willing to deprive the laborer of the immediate use of what he has labored for."

† Ὄργανον ζῶον, or κτῆμα ἔμψυχον.

confidence which Abraham reposed in Eliezer (Gen. xv. 2; xxiv. 2 ff.), and all those slaves whom he entrusted with arms (xiv. 14; comp. xxxii. 6; xxxiii. 1), and still more from the significant fact that he circumcised them (Gen. xvii. 23, 27), and thus made them partakers of the blessings and privileges of the covenant of Jehovah by divine direction (v. 12, 13).

JEWISH SLAVERY.

Between the patriarchal and the Mosaic period the Jews were themselves reduced to hard involuntary servitude in Egypt. The introduction to the ten commandments reminds them of their merciful deliverance "out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," that they might be grateful for so great a mercy and show their gratitude by cheerful obedience to his will, and merciful conduct towards their servants (comp. Deut. v. 15; xv. 15).

Moses, or God through him neither established nor abolished slavery; he authorized and regulated it as an ancient domestic and social institution, which could not be dispensed with at that time, but he also so modified and humanized the same as to raise it far above the character of slavery among the gentiles, even the highly cultivated Greeks and Romans.—The moral law which is embodied in the decalogue, mentions "men-servants and maid-servants" twice, but evidently and most wisely in such general terms and connections as to be equally applicable to hired servants and bond servants. The fourth commandment protects the religious rights of the servants by securing to them the blessings of the Sabbath day; the tenth commandment guards the rights of the master against the passion and cupidity of his neighbor.

The civil law makes first an important distinction between the Hebrew and the Gentile servants. It regarded freedom as the normal and proper condition of the Israelite, and prohibited his reduction to servitude except in two cases, either for theft, when unable to make full restitution (Ex. xxii. 3), or in extreme poverty, when he might sell himself (Levit. xxv. 39). Cruel creditors sometimes forced insolv-

ent debtors into servitude (2 Kings iv. 1; Is. l. 1; Nehem. v. 5; comp. Matth. xviii. 25), but this was an abuse which is nowhere authorized. The Hebrew servant moreover was not to be treated like an ordinary bondman, and regained his freedom, without price, and with an outfit (Deut. xv. 14), after six years of service, unless he preferred from attachment or other reasons to remain in bondage to his master. The remembrance of Israel's bondage of Egypt and his merciful deliverance by the hand of the Lord, should inspire every Israelite with kindness to his bondmen. The jubilee, or every fiftieth year, when the whole theocracy was renewed, gave liberty to all slaves of Hebrew descent without distinction, whether they had served six years or not, and made them landed proprietors by restoring to them the possessions of their fathers. Consequently the law, in permitting the Hebrew to be sold, merely suspended his freedom for a limited period, guarded him during the same against bad treatment, and provided for his ultimate emancipation. This is clear from the principal passages bearing on the subject.

"If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself; if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have born him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free: then his master shall bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him for ever*." Exod. xxi. 2–6.

"And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee; thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant: but as an hired servant, and as a sojourner, he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee: and then shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return. For they are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: they shall not be sold as bondmen. Thou shalt not

* i. e., become permanent and inheritable property like the slaves of heathen origin (Lev. xxv. 46); or, as the Jewish doctors take it, till the year of jubilee. Such limitation, seems to be justified by Lev. xxv. 41, 10.

rule over him with rigor: but shalt fear thy God." Levit. xxv. 39–43. Comp. Deuteron. xv. 12–18.

"This is the word that came unto Jeremiah from the Lord, after that the king Zedekiah had made a covenant with all the people which were at Jerusalem, to proclaim liberty unto them; that every man should let his man-servant, and every man his maid-servant, being an Hebrew or a Hebrewess, go free; that none should serve himself of them, to wit, of a Jew his brother." Jerem. xxxiv. 8, 9.

Concerning the heathen bondmen who constituted the great majority of slaves among the Hebrews, the law was more severe, and attached them permanently to their master and his posterity.

"Both thy bondmen and they bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen for ever: but over your brethren the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigor." Levit. xxv. 44–46.

But the Mosaic dispensation nowhere degraded even the heathen slave to mere property, or a thing, as the Roman law. It regarded and treated him as a moral and religious being, admitted him to the blessings of the covenant by circumcision (Gen. xvii. 12, 13, 23, 27; Exod. xii. 44), secured him the rest of the sabbath and the festival days and other religious privileges, and protected him against the passion and cruelty of the master and restored him to freedom in case he was violently injured in eye or tooth, that is, according to the spirit of the law, in any member whatever. Finally it numbered kipnapping, or forcible reduction of a freeman, especially an Israelite, to servitude in time of peace, among the blackest crimes, and punished it with death. Take the following passages which refer to all slaves:

"If a man smite his servant, or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand; he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished; for he is his money." Exod. xxi. 20, 21.

"If a man smite the eye of his servant, or the eye of his maid, that it perish, he shall let him go free for his eye's sake. And if he smite

out his servant's tooth, he shall let him go free for his tooth's sake." Exod. xxi. 26, 27.

"The seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant," etc., Exod. xx. 10.

. . . "that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou. And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt," etc. Deut. v. 14, 15. Comp. Deut. xvi. 11, 12, 14 with reference to the annual festivals.

"And he that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." Exod. xxi. 16.

"If a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel, and maketh merchandize of him, or selleth him; then that thief shall die; and thou shalt put evil away from among you." Deut. xxiv. 7.

Such guarantees contrast very favorably with the Roman slave code which knew of no civil and religious rights of the slave, reduced him to the level of mere property and gave the master authority to torture him for evidence and to put him to death. Hence we never read of slave insurrections among the Jews, as among the Greeks and Romans. The difference in treatment was the natural result of a different theory. For the Old Testament teaches the unity of the human race, which is favorable to general equality before the law, while heathen slavery rested on the opposite doctrine of the essential inferiority of all barbarians to the Greeks and Romans and their constitutional unfitness for the rights and privileges of freemen.

If we consider the low and degraded condition of the idolatrous heathen tribes, with whom the Jews in their early history came into contact, we have a right to think that slavery was an actual benefit to them and a training school from barbarian idolatry and licentiousness to the knowledge and worship of the true God. This would explain the more easily a passage, which is sometimes falsely quoted by Abolitionists as a conclusive argument against the fugitive slave law:

"Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him." Deut. xxiii. 15, 16.

This can, of course, not be understood as applying to all slaves indiscriminately, without involving the law in glaring self-contradiction; for the servants of the Jews were protected by law, like any other property (Exod. xx. 17), they had to be restored, if lost (Deut. xxii. 4; comp 1 Kings II. 39, 40), and passed as an inheritance from parents to children (Levit. xxv. 46); but it must refer, as all good commentators hold, to foreign slaves only, who escaped from heathen masters to the boundaries of the theocracy, and who, if returned, would have been punished with cruel tortures or certain death. Extradition, in such cases, would have been an act of inhumanity repugnant to the spirit of the Jewish religion. Such unfortunate fugitives found an asylum in Israel, as they did even in heathen temples, and since Constantine in every Christian church.

From all that has been said then thus far, we may conclude that, according to the Old Testament, the institution of involuntary and perpetual servitude dates from after the fall and first appears as a punishment and curse; that it was known and practised by the patriarchs; recognized and protected by the Mosaic legislation, but also softened and guarded against various abuses; and that every returning jubilee made an end to Jewish servitude. It does not appear, indeed, that slaves of heathen descent were included in the blessing of jubilee. Their exclusion would have to be explained on the ground of the necessary particularism of the old economy, which was intended merely as a national training school for the universal religon of the Gospel. But on the other hand, the fact that all slaves in Jewish families seem to have been circumcised (Gen. xvii. 12, 13, 23, 27), at least if they wished it (comp. Exod. xii. 44), and were thus incorporated into the Jewish church, seems to justify a more general application of the blessing of jubilee, to all slaves, or at least to all who were circumcised, whether of Jewish descent or not. The language in Levit. xxv. 10 makes no exceptions: "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout the land *unto all the inhabitants thereof:* it shall be a jubilee unto you;

and ye shall return *every man* unto his possession, and ye shall return *every man* unto his family." At all events the jubilee was a type of that "acceptable year of the Lord" (Is. lxi. 1; Luke iv. 19) which gave spiritual deliverance to all, and will be finally realized in the restoration of all men to their original dignity, freedom and equality, through the Christian salvation from every form of bondage.

GREEK AND ROMAN SLAVERY.

Before we proceed to explain the relation of the New Testament to slavery, it may be well to cast a glance at the extent and character of this institution among those highly civilized heathen nations, among which Christianity was first established.

The ancient republics of Greece and Rome had no idea of general and inalienable rights of men. They consisted in the rule of a small minority of freemen over a mass of foreigners and slaves. The Greeks and Romans looked with aristocratic contempt upon all other nations as barbarians and unfit for freedom. Their philosophers and lawgivers regarded slavery as the natural, normal and perpetual condition of society and assumed a constitutional or essential difference between the free-born and the slaves. Aristotle calls a *doulos* or slave "an animated tool, just as a tool is a soulless slave." Occasionally slaves distinguished themselves by great talent or some special merit, and were then used as teachers, or were emancipated, or they bought their liberty. But these were exceptions, which confirmed the rule. The great mass remained in a degraded and wretched condition, whether they belonged to the State as the Helots in Sparta, or to individuals. An active slave trade was carried on, particularly in the Euxine, the eastern provinces, the coast of Africa, Britain, and in the city of Rome where human beings from every tongue and clime were continually offered for sale, generally as nature made them and with a scroll around their neck, on which their good and bad qualities were specified.

The Romans made no distinction between race and color

in this respect. All captives of war, whether Scythians, Phrygians, Nubians, Jews, Gauls, Spaniards, Britons, Germans, also insolvent debtors and criminals were generally sold into slavery. The distinguished Latin poets Terentius, and probably Plautus, the former an African, the latter an Italian by birth, were originally slaves, but acquired their freedom by their talents and industry ; and Horace, who moved in the highest circles of the Roman aristocracy, descended from a freedman. The Jewish synagogue at Rome consisted mostly of freedmen. During the Jewish war, Josephus tells us, ninety seven thousand Jews were made captives and either sold to individuals as cheap as horses, or condemned as slaves of the State to hard work in the Egyptian mines, or put to death.

Slavery extended over every province and embraced, according to Gibbon's low estimate, sixty millions, or at least one half of the entire population of the empire under the reign of Claudius ; but according to more recent calculations the slaves outnumbered the citizens three to one. For in Attica, the classical spot of Greece, there were, three hundred years before Christ, four hundred thousand slaves (who were counted per head, like cattle) to only twenty one thousand free citizens (exclusive, however, of women and minors), and ten thousand foreign residents. In Sparta the disproportion seems to have been still greater, and to keep down their numbers the Helots were sometimes cruelly and treacherously massacred by thousands. Many wealthy Romans possessed from ten to twenty thousand slaves for mere ostentation. Roman ladies of rank and fashion kept as many as two hundred for their toilet alone. The slaves did all kind of work in the house, the shop, and the kitchen. The Latin language has a great many names for the various classes into which they were divided according to their occupation.*

* Those for instance who attended to the table alone, were subdivided into *pistores, coqui, fartores, obsonatores, structores, scissores, pocillatores ;* those who were employed for the wardrobe and toilet, into *vestiarii, textores, tonsores, ornatrices, ciniflones, unctores, balneatores, etc. etc.*

In the eyes of the Roman law till the time of the Antonines the slaves were in the fullest sense of the term the property of the master and reduced to the level of the brute. A distinguished writer on civil law thus describes their condition: "The slaves were in a much worse state than any cattle whatsoever. They had no head in the State, no name, no title, no register; they were not capable of being injured; they had no heirs and therefore could make no will; they were not entitled to the rights of matrimony, and therefore had no relief in case of adultery; nor were they proper objects of cognation and affinity, but of quasi-cognation only; they could be sold, transferred, or pawned, as goods or personal estate, for goods they were, and as such they were esteemed; they might be tortured for evidence, punished at the discretion of their lord, and even put to death by his authority; together with many other civil incapacities which I have no room to enumerate." Cato the elder expelled his old and sick slaves out of house and home. Hadrian, one of the most humane of the emperors, willfully destroyed the eye of one of his slaves with a pencil. Roman ladies punished their waiters with sharp iron instruments for the most trifling offences, while attending half dressed to their toilet. Such legal degradation and cruel treatment had the worst effect upon the character of the slaves. They are described by the ancient writers as mean, cowardly, abject, false, voracious, intemperate, voluptuous, also hard and cruel, when placed over others. A proverb prevailed in the Roman empire: "As many slaves as many enemies." Hence the constant danger of servile insurrections which more than once brought the republic to the brink of ruin and seemed to justify the severest measures in self-defense.

It is true, self-interest, natural kindness, and education had their due effect even among the heathen and prompted many masters to take proper care of their slaves. Seneca and Plutarch gave excellent advice which tended to mitigate the evil wherever it was carried out. Legislation also began to improve in the second century and transferred

the power over the life of the slave from the master to the magistrate. But at that time the humanizing influence of Christianity already made itself felt even upon its enemies and impregnated the atmosphere of public opinion.

Roman slavery then was far worse than Jewish servitude. It regarded and treated the slaves as chattles and things, while the latter still respected them as persons, provided for their moral and religious wants, and cheered them with the hope of deliverance in the year of jubilee.

Justice as well as due regard for our national honor and the influence of Christianity requires us also to place the Roman system of slavery far below the American, although the latter no doubt borrowed many obnoxious and revolting statutes from the Roman slave-code. Roman slavery extended over the whole empire and embraced more than one half of its subjects, American slavery is confined to the Southern States and to one eighth of our population; the former made no distinction between race and color, the latter is based on the inferiority of the African race; Rome legalized and protected the foreign slave trade, the United States long since prohibited it as piracy and thus placed the stigma of condemnation upon the original source of negro-slavery; the former treated the slaves as mere property, the latter distinctly recognize and protect them as men; the former cared nothing for the souls of the poor slaves, while the latter can never deny altogether the restraining, humanizing and ennobling influence of the Christian religion upon the master, nor refuse its benefits and privileges to the slave.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND SLAVERY.

Such was the system of slavery when Christ appeared, to deliver the world from the bondage of sin and death and to work out a salvation for all races, classes and conditions of men.

The manner in which Christianity dealt with an institution so universally prevalent in its worst forms and so intimately interwoven with the whole private and public life

in the Roman empire, is a strong proof of its practical wisdom and divine origin. It accomplished what no other religion has even attempted before or since. Without interfering with slavery as a political and oeconomical question, without encouraging any revolution or agitation, without denouncing the character or denying the rights of the slaveholder, or creating discontent among the slaves, without disturbing the peace of a single family, without any appeals to the passions and prejudices of men on the evils and abuses of slavery, without requiring or even suggesting immediate emancipation, in one word, without changing the outward and legal relation between the two parties, but solemnly enforcing the rights and duties arising from it to both: Christ and the apostles, nevertheless, from within by purely spiritual and peaceful means, by teaching the common origin and common redemption, the true dignity, equality and destiny of men, by inculcating the principles of universal justice and love, and by raising the most degraded and unfortunate classes of society to virtue and piety, produced a radical moral reformation of the system and prepared the only effectual way for its gradual legitimate and harmless extinction. The Christian Church followed this example and dealt with the system of slavery in the same spirit wherever it found it as an established fact. Any other method would have either effected nothing at all, or done more harm than good. An attempt at sudden emancipation with such abundant materials for servile wars would have thrown the world into hopeless confusion and brought dissolution and ruin upon the empire and the cause of Christianity itself.

The relation of the Gospel to slavery wherever it still exists, remains the same to day as it was in the age of the apostles. The New Testament was written for all ages and conditions of society; it knows no Mason and Dixon's line, and may be as profitably read and as fully practiced in South Carolina as in Massachusetts.

The position of the New Testament is neither anti-slavery, nor pro-slavery in our modern sense of the term, but rises

above all partizan views. It nowhere establishes or abolishes the institution of slavery, as little as monarchy or any other form of government; it neither sanctions nor condemns it; it never meddles with its political and financial aspects and leaves the system as to its policy and profitableness to the secular rulers. But it recognizes, tolerates and ameliorates it as an existing and then universally established fact; it treats it under its moral bearings and enjoins the duties and responsibilities of masters and servants; it corrects its abuses, cures the root of the evil and provides the only rational and practical remedy for its ultimate extinction wherever it can be abolished legitimately and with benefit to both parties. Yet, in profound and far-seeing wisdom, it does all this in such a manner that its teachings and admonitions retain their full force and applicability, though every trace of involuntary and perpetual servitude should disappear from the earth.

Hence the unlearned reader of the New Testament seldom observes its allusions to slavery, and may read the Gospels and Epistles without dreaming of the fact, that at the time of their composition more than one half of the human race was kept in literal bondage. Our popular Versions have properly and wisely avoided the words *slaveholder* and *slave*—like the framers of the American Constitution—and have mostly substituted the words *master* and *servant*, which are equally applicable to a free state of society, or the general distinctions of superior and inferior, ruler and subject, which will continue to the end of time. It must be admitted, however, that the term *servant*, as its etymology from the Latin suggests, was originally employed in the menial sense and has acquired a nobler meaning under the influence of Christianity upon all domestic and social relations.

The Greek language has a number of terms for the various kinds of servants, six or seven of which occur in the New Testament.* We will explain three as having a bearing upon the present discussion.

---

* θεράπων, *therapon*, translated *servant* (*minister* would be better, to distin-

1) *misthios* and *misthotos* mean a *hired* servant or *hireling*, and are so translated in the five passages of the New Testament where they occur. They may be slaves and hired out by their masters, or they may not.

2) *doulos* is more frequently used than all other terms put together. We find it, if we made no mistake in counting, one hundred and twenty three times, namely seventy three times in the Gospels, three times in the Acts, thirty three times in the Epistles, and fourteen times in the Apocalypse.* It is uniformly translated *servant* in our English Bible, except in seven instances in the Epistles and in Revelation, where it is rendered either *bond* or *bondman*.† *Doulos* (originally an adjective, *bound*, from the verb *deo*, *to bind*), like the Latin *servus*, means properly a *bond* servant, or a *slave*, especially one by birth, and is opposed to *eleutheros*, *free-born*, or *freed*, *made free*.‡ Yet like

guish it from *doulos*), occurs but once, and then of Moses, in an honorable sense, Hebr. iii. 5; ὑπιρέτης, *hyperetes*, generally translated *officer*, sometimes *servant*, or *minister*, occurs several times in the Gospels and Acts, and once in the Epistles (1 Cor. iv. 1); διάκονος, *diakonos*, which the Common Version mostly renders *minister*, sometimes *servant*, and when used in its official sense, *deacon*; μίσθιος and μισθωτός, *misthios*, *misthotos* (corresponding to the Hebrew שָׂכִיר) a *hired* servant; δοῦλος, *doulos* (see above); οἰκέτης, *oiketes*, a *domestic doulos* or *household servant* and so translated in Acts x. 7; παῖς, *pais*, often translated *servant*, sometimes *child*, the least ignominious term for slave, and rather a title of endearment like the Latin *puer* and the English *boy*.

* Besides the masculine δοῦλος, the feminine δούλη occurs three times, twice of the Virgin Mary, the *handmaid* of the Lord (Luke i. 38, 48, and in a more general application Acts ii 18); the neuter δοῦλον twice (Rom. vi. 19: Yield your members *servants* to righteousness); the noun δουλεία five times and is uniformly rendered *bondage*; the verb δουλεύω twenty five times, generally rendered *to serve*, sometimes *to be in bondage*; and the transitive verb δουλόω, *to bring into bondage*, *to enslave*, eight times.

† namely 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28; Eph. vi. 8; Col. iii. 11; Rev. vi. 15; xiii. 16; xix. 18.

‡ Trench, in his little work on the *Synonyms of the New Testament*, N. York ed. 1857, p. 53, defines δοῦλος as "one in a permanent relation of servitude to another, and that altogether apart from any ministration to that other at th present moment rendered; but the θεράπων is the performer of present services, without respect to the fact, whether as a freeman or as a slave he renders them: and thus there goes constantly with the word the sense of one whose services are tenderer, nobler, freer than those of the δοῦλος." Compare also J. Theod. Vömel, *Synonymisches Woerterbuch*, Francf. 1819, p. 78, 79 and 218, 219.

the Hebrew *ebhed*, of which it is the Greek equivalent in the New Testament, it is not necessarily degrading, but simply a term of government and may signify a subject from the highest to the lowest ranks. Ammonius, an ancient writer on Greek synonyms, of the fourth century, gives the word this general sense,* and the Greeks called the Persians *douloi* as subjects of an absolute monarch. The Bible frequently uses the word of the highest and noblest kind of service, the voluntary service of God, which is perfect freedom, as St. Augustine says: *Deo servire vera libertas est.* Moses, the prophets, the apostles and all true Christians are called *douloi* or servants of God and Christ, as being entirely and for life, yet voluntarily and cheerfully devoted to his service.† St. Paul glories in this title,‡ and so does St. Peter, St. James, St. Jude, and St. John.§ It would be quite improper in any of these passages to substitute *slave* for *servant.*

3) *andrapodon*‖ means always a *slave*, especially one *enslaved in war.* This term is degrading in its etymology and neuter gender, and is used in the vile and abject sense, when the slaves are statistically enumerated or otherwise represented as mere property, or chattles, or things. Now it is a remarkable fact, that the New Testament, which so frequently uses the term *doulos* and about half a dozen words more or less resembling it in meaning, never employs the term *andrapodon*, except once in the derivative

* Δοῦλοι, he says as quoted by Vömel, *εἰσι καὶ οἱ ἡδονῶν, καὶ πάντες οἱ ὑποτεταγμένοι ὑπὸ τὸν βασιλέα* (all who are subjected to the king).

† Compare Luke xii. 37: "Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching;" Acts xvi. 17: "These men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation;" 1 Pet. ii. 16: "as the servants of God;" Rev. i 1: "to show unto his servants;" x. 7: "declared to his servants the prophets;" xv. 3: "the song of Moses the servant of God;" xix. 5: "Praise our God, all ye his servants."

‡ Rom. i. 1: "Paul a servant (*doulos*) of Jesus Christ;" Gal. i. 10; Phil. i. 1; Tit. i 1.

§ 2 Pet. i. 1; Jas. i. 1. Jude 1: Rev. i. 1.

‖ *ἀνδράποδον*, either from *ἀνήρ* and *ποῦς*, the foot of the conqueror placed on the neck of the conquered, to indicate complete subjugation, or from *ἀνήρ* and *ἀποδόσθαι*, to sell a man.

compound, *andrapodistes*, a *man-stealer*, or *slave-trader*, and then in the worst possible company with murderers, whoremongers, liars, perjurers and other gross sinners.* As the term is of very frequent occurrence among the classics and must have been perfectly familiar to the apostles, the omission is significant and must imply the condemnation of the idea involved in it. It suggests to us two different conceptions of slavery, the one represented by the word *doulos*, the other by the word *andrapodon;* the one prevailing among the Jews, the other among the heathen; the one which still regards and treats the slave as a person, the other which degrades him to mere property; the one recognized by the apostles, the other disowned by them as irreconcilable with the spirit of the Gospel.

Slavery indeed always implies the double relation of lordship or government, and of possession or property. The former makes the slave-holder simply a ruler and patron of his subject, and although liable to abuse, like every other kind of power in the hands of sinful and erring man, may be altogether unselfish, humane and beneficial, just as an absolute monarchy may be the best form of government in the hands of a good monarch who rules in the fear of God and with a single eye to the happiness of his subjects while incapable of self-government. The latter makes the slave-holder the proprietor or owner of the slave and gives him the legal—though not the moral—right to turn the *doulos* into an *andrapodon*, the person into a mere thing or "animated tool," and to dispose of him as of any other article of merchandize for his own profit. The predominance of the one or the other of these ideas determines the character of the institution and tends either to the ele-

* 1 Tim. i. 10. The Common Version and most commentators translate this word *menstealer*, or *kidnapper*, who enslaves free persons and sells them, —a crime punished with death under the Old Testament, Exod. xxi. 16; Deut. xxiv. 7. But some dictionaries assign to ἀνδραποδιστής also the more general meaning of *slave-trader*, just as κερματιστής is not a *money-stealer*, but a *money-changer* (John ii. 14). It is pretty certain that the apostle would have embraced all persons engaged in the horrors of the African slave-trade under the same category and condemnation.

vation, or the degredation of the slave. In the Jewish servitude the governmental idea strongly prevailed over the mercenary; in the Roman, the mercenary over the governmental. The New Testament retains and recognizes the governmental idea as an existing fact, and nowhere denounces it as sinful in itself, but it divests it of its harshness and guards it against abuse, by reminding the master of his moral responsibility and inspiring him with kindness and charity to his slave as a brother in Christ and fellow-heir of the same kingdom of glory in heaven. But the mercenary idea is entirely ignored in the New Testament or indirectly condemned with every other form of selfishness. Hence we find not a word about traffic in men, about buying and selling human beings ; the very idea is repugnant to the spirit of the Gospel. The slave, without distinction of race and color, is uniformly spoken of as a personal being clothed with the same moral rights and duties, redeemed by the same blood of Christ, sanctified by the same Spirit, and called to the same immortality and glory as his master. Wherever the governmental idea holds the mercenary so completely in check and yields to the influence of Christian morality, it may be a wholesome training school for inferior races, as it is in fact with the African negroes, until they are capable to govern themselves.

Christianity attaches comparatively little importance to slavery and freedom in the civil and political sense. Its mission lies far deeper. It is a new moral creation, which commences with the inmost life of humanity, although it looks to the resurrection of the body and the glorious liberty of the children of God as its final consummation. It is intensely spiritual in its nature and takes its position far above the temporal relations of this world, which is continually changing and passing away. Wholly occupied with the eternal interests and welfare of man, it sinks all the social distinctions of earth and time in the common sinfulness and guilt before God and the common salvation through Christ. Rising above the limits of nationality and race, it proclaims a universal religion and opens a fountain

of pardon and peace, where the Jew and the Gentile, the Greek and the barbarian, the freeman and the slave, on the single condition of renouncing sin and turning to God, may receive the same spiritual and eternal blessings and unite in a common brotherhood of faith and love. It is so pliable and applicable, so free and independent in its own elevated sphere, that it can accommodate itself to every condition and can be practised in every calling of life. It requires no man to give up his occupation after conversion, unless it be sinful in its nature; but remaining in it, he should faithfully serve God and honor his profession. If a slave can legitimately gain his freedom, so much the better, for freedom is the normal condition of man; but if he cannot, he need not be discouraged, for by faith in Christ he is a freeman in the highest and best sense of the term, a brother and fellow-heir, with his believing master, of eternal glory in heaven. Civil bondage may be a great evil, but not near as great as the moral bondage of sin; civil freedom may be a great good, but only temporal at best, and not to be compared with the spiritual freedom which elevates the humblest Christian slave far above his heathen master. All earthly distinctions and blessings vanish into utter insignificance when compared with the eternal realities of the kingdom of heaven.

This is clearly the view which St. Paul takes in the following passages:

"There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond (*doulos*) nor free (*eleutheros*), there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. iii. 28.

"Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond *nor* free: but Christ *is* all in all." Col. iii. 11.

"For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." 1 Cor. xii. 13.

"Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called *being* a servant? care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use *it* rather [namely *freedom*].* For he that is called in

* It is a singular fact that Chrysostom, and the ancient commentators, supply δουλεια, *slavery*, to the verb in the sense: even if, or although thou mayest be

the Lord, *being* a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, *being* free, is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price: be not ye the servants of men. Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God." 1 Cor. vii. 20–24.

How widely different this position and language of the inspired apostle, who was the greatest benefactor of the slave and the most effectual, because the wisest emancipationist, from that of our modern Abolitionists of the infidel type, who secularize the holy philanthropy of the Gospel, subordinate the spiritual relations to the temporal, magnify the slavery question above every other moral question, denounce slavery under every form, in fierce, bitter, fanatical language, as the greatest sin and crime of our age and country, and our federal constitution, owing to its connection with it, as a "covenant with death and an agreement with hell!"

From this elevated stand-point above the changing and passing distinctions of time and sense, the apostles approach the master and the servant alike with the same call to repent and believe, with the same offer of the gospel salvation, requiring the same change of their heart, though not of their outward condition, admitting both to the Christian Church, inviting them to the same table of the Lord, and urging them as church members to a faithful discharge of the general Christian duties and of those special duties which grow out of their legal and social relation to each other. Take the following exhortations:

Eph. vi. 5–9: "Servants (*douloi*), be obedient to them that are *your* masters (*tois kyriois*) according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; not with eye service as men-pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God

---

free, remain rather a slave in order to show the more by contrast thy spiritual freedom. But Calvin, Grotius, Whitby, Doddridge, Olshausen, Neander and nearly all modern interpreters (except De Wette and Meyer) supply ἐλευθερία, *freedom*,—an exposition already mentioned although not approved by Chrysostom, and clearly preferable on account of the verb *use*, the particles *but* and *rather* (ἀλλὰ—μᾶλλον) and of v. 23 ("be not ye the servants of men"), as well as for internal reasons. For it can not be doubted for a moment that Paul, himself a Roman citizen, regarded freedom as the normal and far preferable state, wherever it could be legitimately and honorably attained.

from the heart; with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men: knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether *he be* bond or free.—And ye masters (*kyrioi*), do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him."

Col. iii. 22–25: "Servants obey in all things *your* masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservice as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God; and whatsoever ye do, do *it* heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons."

Col. iv. 1: "Masters, give unto *your* servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven."

1 Tim. vi. 1–2: "Let as many servants as are under the yoke [i. e. bond servants] count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise *them*, because they are brethren; but rather do *them* service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort."

Tit. ii. 9, 10: "*Exhort* servants to be obedient unto their own masters, *and* to please *them* well in all *things* [which legitimately belong to them in their capacity as masters]; not answering again; not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things."

1 Peter ii. 18–20: "Servants (*oiketai*, domestic slaves, or household servants) *be* subject to *your* masters (*tois despotais*) with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory *is it*, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer *for it*, ye take it patiently, this *is* acceptable with God."

The sense of all these passages is plain and can not be mistaken, except under the influence of the strongest prejudice against slavery under every form.

First as to the servants, they are nowhere exhorted or advised to run away from their masters, however hard their condition may have been and no doubt was at the time, especially in heathen families, nor to revolt and disobey, but on the contrary to obey their masters, whether heathen or Jewish or Christian, whether hard and cruel or gentle and kind, in all things belonging to their proper

authority and not conflicting with the authority of God and the law of conscience, and to obey cheerfully, in the fear of God and from a sense of duty, and thus to adorn and commend their holy profession; remembering always in their outward bondage that they enjoy spiritual freedom in Christ which no man could take from them, and that in the prospect of everlasting glory in heaven they might well forgo the comparatively small advantage of civil freedom in this present transient life.

Secondly the masters are nowhere required or even advised to emancipate their slaves. This matter, like all direct control over private possessions and secular business, the apostles regarded as lying beyond their proper authority; for Christ himself, with His unfailing wisdom, refused to be a divider of property, and simply warned the contending parties against covetousness (Luke xii. 14.) Hence they left it to the free choice of the slaveholders and their own sense of duty, which in this case depends upon the effects of the measure or the probable benefit arising from it to both parties, especially the slave himself. Christ never alludes to the subject of emancipation in his personal teaching; but if the servant of the gentile centurion was a slave, as in all probability he was,* we would have a strong proof from his own mouth for the perfect compatibility of slaveholding with a high order of Christian piety; for he said of the centurion: "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel" (Matth. viii. 10; Luke vii. 9). The apostles expressly denounce men-stealing or—if you choose to give the word *andrapodistes* this wider sense—slave-trading (1 Tim. i. 10); but they never enumerate slaveholding in any of their catalogues of sins and crimes, however complete and minute;† they nowhere make non-slaveholding a term of church membership; on the contra-

* In Luke vii. 2 he is called δοῦλος, *doulos* and in Matth. viii. 6 παῖς, *pais*, which is the least ignominious term for slave. It is evident both from Matth. viii. 9 and Luke vii. 8, that the centurion had many soldiers and servants under his authority. He was probably a proselyte of the gate, or a half convert to Judaism, but certainly uncircumcised, and hence held up to the Jews proper as an example of faith.

† For instance Rom. i. 29–31; Gal. v. 19–21; compare Matth. xv. 19;

ry, St. Paul speaks of certain masters of "servants under the yoke," i. e., slaveholders, who are "faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit" (1 Tim. vi. 1, 2); and addresses Philemon, who was a slaveholder at the time, as "a brother, dearly beloved and fellow-laborer," that is, either an officer of the congregation at Colosse, or an active lay-member (Philem. v. 1, 7). On the other hand the apostles still less recommend the masters to sell their slaves and to make money out of them, and by doing so perhaps to sunder the sacred ties between husband and wife, parents and children. But they uniformly exhort them to give to their slaves all that is just and equitable; to treat them with humanity, kindness and charity, even as they would like to be treated according to the well known maxim of Christ; to forbear even threatening, not to mention those cruel punishments which the Roman law authorized and which were so common at the time; and in this whole relation to remember that they, too, have a Master in heaven, that the Christian slaves are freedmen of Christ and their brethren by faith, and that God is no respecter of persons.

The most striking example of the moral reformation which the spirit of Christianity carried into the institution of slavery, without interfering with its legal rights, is furnished by St. Paul's Epistle to Philemon. The apostle had converted the runaway slave Onesimus at Rome, and although he might have made good use of him, he sent him back to his rightful master Philemon, yet no longer as a servant or slave (*doulos*) only, "but more than a servant, a brother beloved, especially to me, but now much more unto thee, both in the flesh [i. e., in his temporal or earthly relations as a servant, compare Eph. vi. 5] and in the Lord" [i. e., his spiritual relation as a Christian brother], adding the request to receive him as he would the apostle himself (v. 16, 17).*

Here we have the whole doctrine and practice of Christianity on this subject as in a nut-shell. Paul exhibits in this most touching letter the highest type of the Christian

Mark vii. 21, 22; 1 Cor. v. 11; vi. 9, 10; Eph. v. 5; Col. iii. 8, 9; 1 Tim. i. 9, 10; 2 Tim. iii. 2, 3, 4.

* That Onesimus was a slave, is manifest both from the general tenor of the

gentleman and philanthropist. He distinctly acknowledges the legal and social relation as it existed between Philemon and Onesimus, and combines the strictest regard for the rights of the one with the deepest interest in the welfare of the other. He addresses the slaveholder as a "brother, dearly beloved and fellow-laborer," and restores to him his servant, but as a Christian brother, pleading for him as for his own child, promising reparation if he had done wrong, demanding a remission of all penalty, soliciting the sympathy and affection of the master for the penitent fugitive, and promising to receive these favors as bestowed upon himself. This is the love of an inspired apostle, himself a prisoner at the time, for a poor runaway slave! And yet it is only a spark of that love which induced the eternal Son of God to shed his own blood for the sins of the world.

If our Southern slaveholders were all animated by this heavenly spirit of love and would act on Paul's request to Philemon, they would indeed become the greatest benefactors of the unfortunate negro race.

It is perfectly evident then that Christianity made no direct and immediate change in the outward legal and social relation of slavery; but wherever it prevailed, it transfused a new spirit into the institution, changed the hard Roman slavery into a mild patriarchal service and subordinated the social distinction of the two parties to the religious equality and brotherhood in Christ, their common Lord and Saviour. It cured the root of the evil and produced a new order of society even where the outward form continued unchanged. It always works, like leaven, from within, and not from without; it frees the soul first and then the body. The opposite process, commencing with external and sudden emancipation, would only have done harm and

---

Epistle, and the implication in οὐκ ἔτι ὡς δοῦλον, *no more as a slave*, v. 16, and is universally conceded by all ancient and modern commentators of any note. It was left for Mr. Albert Barnes, in the nineteenth century, to make the great discovery that Onesimus *may* have been an *apprentice*, because "it is quite as common for apprentices to run away, as it is for slaves!" Legendary tradition relates, that he was afterwards set free by Philemon and became a Christian bishop of Beroea in Macedonia.

involved master and slave in common ruin, before the true spiritual remedy could have been applied.

The external extinction of slavery, we all know, was the slow process of centuries and is not yet completed to this day. It still exists under various forms over a great part of the Christian world. Nevertheless the progress is steady and irresistible. Wherever the spirit of Christianity, which is the spirit of universal justice and love, works its way into the fibres of domestic and public life, it inevitably raises the intellectual and moral condition of the slave population, and thus prepares them for the right use of a higher social position, so that in due time, all other interests of civilization concurring, the legal emancipation becomes not only practicable and harmless, but desirable and beneficial to both parties. In this gradual, peaceful and righteous way Christianity mastered the Jewish, Greek, and Roman slavery of ancient times; it then modified and conquered the various forms of bondage and vassalage among the Romanic and Germanic nations of the middle ages; it is now assisting in the gradual emancipation of the twenty-two millions of serfs in Russia; and it will no doubt in its own good way and time solve also the difficult problem of African servitude in America for the common benefit of the white and the black races, which are here mysteriously and providentially brought together.

Of all forms of slavery the American is the most difficult to dispose of, because it is not only a question of domestic institution and political œconomy, but of race. *The negro question lies far deeper than the slavery question.* Emancipation here is no solution. The negro question was never presented in such magnitude and with such responsibility to any other people; for England and France had to do with it only in their distant colonies, and instead of solving the problem by immediate and absolute emancipation, they have ruined their colonies and presented the question of race in a more difficult form. Should we then not have patience and forbearance and wait the time which Providence in its own wisdom and mercy has appointed for the solution of a problem which thus far has baffled the wisdom of the wisest statesmen. But the process of solution

has undoubtedly begun long since. We should never ungratefully forget, amidst all the exciting passions, criminations and recriminations of political parties, that in the hands of Providence and under the genial influence of Christianity this American slavery in spite of all its incidental evils and abuses has already accomplished much good. It has been thus far a wholesome training school for the negro from the lowest state of heathenism and barbarism to some degree of Christian civilization, and in its ultimate result it will no doubt prove an immense blessing to the whole race of Ham.

The less the people in the North meddle with the system in the way of political agitation and uncharitable abuse, the sooner this desirable end, so dear to every Christian and patriotic heart, will be reached. The sooner we take the vexing and perplexing question out of the turmoil of federal politics, and leave it with the several slave States, in the hands of Christian philanthrophy, and of an all-wise Providence, the better for the peace of the whole country.

In the mean time it is the duty of the slaveholding States, on whom the whole responsibility and legislative authority properly devolves, not, indeed, to precipitate the four millions of negroes into a state of independence for which they are wholly unprepared and which could only be disastrous to them, but by separate State action and remedial codes to diminish as much as possible the evils and to prevent the abuses of slavery in their own midst, to provide for the proper moral and religious training of the negroes committed to their care, and thus to make the institution beneficial to both races while it lasts, and to prepare the way for its ultimate extinction without injury to either. In this noble effort the people of the South eminently deserve the hearty sympathy, the friendly counsel, and the liberal coöperation of their brethren in the North.

This is the Bible view and the Bible remedy of slavery. It is as true and effective to day as ever. On this basis alone can peace be restored, the Union preserved, and the greatest modern problem of political œconomy and Christian philanthropy solved for the good of America, of Africa and the world.

An Inquiry into the Nature, Foundation, and Extent of Moral Obligation, involving the Nature of Duty, of Holiness, and of Sin: being an Introduction to the Study of Moral Science in all its branches, including the Legal, Theological, and Governmental. By David Metcalf. Boston: Crosby, Nichols Lee & Co. 1860. pp. 486.

An elaborate and consistent discussion of the doctrine of eudaemonism—the theory of moral obligation, of holiness and sin, which holds *right* to be the tendency of an action to promote happiness, either individual or general, or both, and *wrong* to be the tendency of an action to produce misery. The author begins with the general principle that *all the Good*, and *only that Good*, which can be done, ought to be done. p. 19. This is the primary, fundamental, original law, and *ultimate* rule of all moral obligation, of duty, of right, of justice, and of all righteous doing. p. 20. The only ultimate and absolute good, is *happiness*, which is the greatest enjoyment of which an individual is susceptible, or of which the universe is susceptible. Right is only a relative good; a good because it is the means of producing happiness. Holiness is not an absolute or ultimate good, but a relative good; it is not an end in itself, but only a means to some other end; that end is the well-being of the individual, and of the human race; for happiness and the means of happiness include all possible good conceivable. p. 93. So of virtue, which is moral goodness. The moral goodness and moral value of holy action lies ultimately in its being the voluntary, intended promotion of happiness; or in the designed adaptation and tendency of that action to promote the greatest happiness, as its ultimate object. Therefore all moral goodness is relative. p. 89. Moral obligation is that by which rational beings are bound to choose the best and most efficacious means of doing all the good in their power; p. 22, and *all good* consists either in some agreeable feeling or happy state of a sentient being; or in some thing or being which is productive of some happy state. p. 71. Moral law is a rule of voluntary action to moral agents, which rule requires such moral acts as are best adapted to produce the most valuable amount of general well-being. p 23.

According to this theory God Himself is not the absolute good. Though the only absolute being, the Creator of the universe, and the Fountain of all blessedness, he is nevertheless only a relative good—a good in as far as he produces, or promotes human happiness. Man is the ultimate end; and God is valuable as means. Nor is Christ the ultimate good. The true God united to perfect manhood, the Life and Light of the world, before whom every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, of things in earth, and things under the earth, and whom every tongue shall confess to be Lord, to the glory of God the Father—He is after all not *the* good but only *a* good; and not even *a* good in Himself, but a good only in His relation to human happiness. The work of Christ is good from its connection with the well-being of the human race and of the universe. Obedience to Christ is obligatory not because He commands it and is worthy of it, but because such obedience advances our highest interests—not from regard to Him, but from regard to self. Faith in Christ as it respects ourselves is a duty, but as it respects Himself only a matter of expediency.

The work of Rev. Mr. Metcalf is the fullest development of the principle of Benevolent Utility, as he calls it, that has been given to the American public. It is logical also The author does not evade the legitimate consequences of the system. To those who wish to examine a discussion of the theory of Ethics, taught by the elder and younger Edwards; by Dwight and Emmons; by Paley and Malebranche; by Epicurus, Aristotle and Aristippus, we commend the book as a systematic, able and earnest production. It can be obtained from the author, Worcester, Mass. Price $1.25cts.

E. V. G.

Sinai and Zion: or, A Pilgrimage through the Wilderness to the Land of Promise. By Benjamin Bausman. With Illustrations. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1861. pp. 543.

We announced this volume in the last number of the *Review*, several advance sheets having been sent us by the enterprizing publishers. An examination of the whole work sustains the opinion we were then prompted to express of its merits. The Land of Promise is a rich theme. The most elaborate works have been written upon it, by those who rank among the first

scholars both in America and in Europe. Yet it is not exhausted. Each production, however thorough and minute it may be, as for example the Biblical Researches by Dr. Edward Robinson, or the Land and the Book, by W. M. Thomson, or Egypt, Ethiopa and Sinai by Dr. Richard Lepsius, only prepares the way for more satisfactory and interesting investigations. Mr. Bausman has looked upon the earthly Canaan with his own eyes, but also with the eyes of others. The rich fruits of others' toils he has gathered industriously; and, thus qualified, he makes his own observations, exercises his own judgment and gives his own views and illustrations.

Leaving Naples for Malta and Alexandria, the author takes us first to Cairo, thence along the Nile to the Pyramids, and by the Red Sea to Mount Sinai; thence across the Arabian Desert, by way of Ezion-geber and Petra, to Beersheba and Jerusalem. After viewing the Holy City and its surroundings, we accompany him to Jericho, the Jordan and the Dead Sea; thence northward to Bethel, Samaria, Esdraelon, Nazareth, Mount Carmel and the Sea of Tiberias; thence, after visiting the Lake of Merom, Cesarea Philippi, Damascus and Baalbeck, we wend our way across the Lebanon to Beiroot, and the cities of the sea-coast. Here we bid adieu to the desolated Land of Promise and, turning our faces once more towards the setting-sun, are home-ward bound.

Along this entire route, than which none more deeply interesting could be projected, one object after another rises to view in life-like images, colored indeed by the author's own mind, yet standing out in distinct outline and in their real proportions and manifold relations. The reflections accompanying the narrative and the descriptions, suggest themselves naturally. They answer the very questions that a pious mind is moved to put by the circumstances of the occasion, as times and places and events are vividly reproduced; and answer them, too, as they are related to the Cross of Christ at whose foot the author stands in faith, looking down the vista of the past in the light which that Cross radiates.

We thank the author for this valuable contribution to the literature of Egypt, Arabia and Palestine; and earnestly recommend the work to all who would see the bleak mountain on which the Law was given by Moses, and traverse the Holy Land where grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

E. V. G.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1861.

Art. I.—THE MORAL CHARACTER OF JESUS CHRIST, OR THE PERFECTION OF CHRIST'S HUMANITY A PROOF OF HIS DIVINITY.

When the Angel of the Lord appeared to Moses in the burning bush, he was commanded to put off his shoes from his feet: for the place whereon he stood, was holy ground. With what reverence and awe then should we approach the contemplation of the great reality—God manifest in the flesh—of which the vision of Moses was but a significant type and shadow!

The life and character of Jesus Christ is truly the holy of holies in the history of the world. Eighteen hundred years have passed away, since He appeared in the fulness of time on this earth to redeem a fallen race from sin and death, and to open a never ceasing fountain of righteousness and life. The ages before him anxiously awaited his coming, as the desire of all nations; the ages after him proclaim his glory and ever extend his dominion. The noblest and best of men under every clime hold him in the purest affection and the profoundest gratitude, not only, but in divine adoration and worship. His name is above every name that may be named in heaven or on earth, and the only one whereby the sinner can be saved. He is Immanuel, God with us, the Eternal Word become flesh, very God and very man in one undivided person, the Author of the new creation, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, the Prophet, Priest and King of regenerate humanity, the Saviour of the world. Thus He stands out to the faith of

the entire Christian Church, Greek, Latin, and Evangelical, in every civilized country on the globe. His power is now greater, his kingdom larger than ever, and will continue to spread, until all nations shall bow before him and kiss his sceptre of righteousness and peace.

Blessed is he who from the heart can believe that Jesus is the Son of God and the fountain of salvation. True faith is indeed no work of nature, but an act of God wrought in the soul by the Holy Ghost, who reveals Christ to us in his true character, as Christ revealed the Father. Faith with its justifying, sanctifying and saving power is independent of science and learning, and may be kindled even in the heart of a little child and an illiterate slave. It is the peculiar glory of the Redeemer and his religion to be coëxtensive with humanity itself without distinction of sex, age, nation and race. His saving grace flows and overflows to all and for all, on the simple condition of repentance and faith.

This fact, however, does not supersede the necessity of thought and argument. Revelation, although above nature and above reason, is not against nature and against reason. On the contrary, nature and the supernatural as has been well said by a distinguished New England divine, "constitute together the one system of God."* Christianity satisfies the deepest intellectual as well as moral and religious wants of man who is created in the image and for the glory of God. It is the revelation of truth as well as of life. Faith and knowledge, pistis and gnosis, are not antagonistic but complementary forces, not enemies but

* By Horace Bushnell in his recent work on the subject. The same idea Dr. John W. Nevin, in his able work "*The Mystical Presence,*" Philad., 1846, p. 199, expresses in these words: "Nature and Revelation, the world and Christianity, as springing from the same divine Mind, are not two different systems joined together in a merely outward way. They form a single whole, harmonious with itself in all its parts. The sense of the one then is necessarily included and comprehended in the sense of the other. The mystery of the new creation must involve in the end the mystery of the old; and the key that serves to unlock the meaning of the first, must serve to unlock the inmost secret of the last."

inseparable twin sisters. Faith precedes knowledge, but it just as necessarily leads to knowledge; while true knowledge on the other hand is always rooted and grounded in faith and tends to confirm and to strengthen it. Thus we find the two combined in the famous confession of Peter when he says in the name of all the other apostles: "We believe and we know that Thou art the Christ."* But so intimately are both connected that we may also reverse the famous maxim of Augustine, Anselm and Schleiermacher: *Fides praecedit intellectum*, and say: *Intellectus praecedit fidem.* For how can we believe in any object without at least some general historical knowledge of its existence and character? Faith even in its first form, as a submission to the authority of God and an assent to the truth of his revelation, is an exercise of the mind and reason as well as of the heart and the will. An idiot or a madman cannot believe. Our religion demands not a blind, but a rational, intelligent faith, and this just in proportion to its strength and fervor aims at an ever deepening insight into its own sacred contents and object.

As living faith in Christ is the soul and centre of all sound practical Christianity and piety, so the true doctrine of Christ is the soul and centre of all sound Christian theology. St. John makes the denial of the incarnation of the Son of God the criterion of antichrist, and consequently the belief in this central truth the test of Christianity. The incarnation and the divine glory shining through the veil of Christ's humanity is the grand theme of his Gospel, which he wrote with the pen of an angel from the very heart of Christ, as his favorite disciple and bosom-friend. The Apostles' Creed starting as it does from the confession of Peter makes the article on Christ most prominent and assigns to it the central position between the preceding article on God the Father, and the succeeding article on the Holy Ghost. The development of ancient Catholic theol-

* John 6, 69: ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν, credidimus et cognovimus. The reverse order we have in John 10, 38: "that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him."

ogy commenced and culminated with the triumphant defense of the true divinity and true humanity of Christ, against the opposite heresies of Judaizing Ebionism which denied the former, and paganizing Gnosticism which resolved the latter into a shadowy phantom. The evangelical Protestant theology is essentially christological or controlled throughout by the proper idea of Christ as the God-man and Saviour. This is emphatically the article of the standing or falling Church. In this the two most prominent ideas of the Reformation, the doctrine of the supremacy of the Scriptures, and the doctrine of justification by grace through faith, meet and are vitally united. Christ's word—the only unerring and efficient guide of truth, Christ's work—the only unfailing and sufficient source of peace, Christ—all in all, this is the principle of genuine Protestantism.

In the construction of the true doctrine of Christ's person we may, with St. John in the prologue to his Gospel, begin from above with his eternal Godhead and proceed through the creation and the preparatory revelation of the Old Testament dispensation till we reach the incarnation and his truly human life for the redemption of the race. Or, with the other evangelists, we may begin from below with his birth from the Virgin Mary and rise up through the successive stages of his earthly life, his discourses and miracles to his assumption into that divine glory which he had before the foundation of the world. The result reached in both cases is the same, that Christ unites in his person the whole fulness of the Godhead and the whole fulness of sinless manhood.

The older theologians, both Catholic and Evangelical, proved the divinity of the Saviour in a direct way from the miracles performed by him, and the prophecies fulfilled in him, from the divine names which he bears, from the divine attributes which are predicated of him, from the divine works which he performed, and from the divine honors which he claimed, and which were fully accorded to him by his apostles and the whole Christian Church to this day.

But it may also be proved by the opposite process, the contemplation of the singular perfection of his humanity, which rises, by almost universal consent even of unbelievers, so far above every human greatness known before or since, that it can only be rationally explained on the ground of such an essential union with the Godhead as he claimed himself and as his inspired apostles ascribed to him. The more deeply we penetrate through the veil of his flesh, the more clearly we behold the glory of the Only Begotten of the Father shining through the same, full of grace and of truth.*

Modern evangelical theology owes this new homage to the Saviour. The powerful attacks of the latest phase of infidelity upon the credibility of the Gospel History call for it and have already led, by way of reaction, to new triumphs of the old faith of the Church in her divine head. Our humanitarian, philanthropic and yet skeptical age is more susceptible for this argument than for the old dogmatic method of demonstration. With Thomas, the representative of honest and earnest skepticism among the apostles, it refuses to believe in the divinity of the Lord unless supported by the testimony of its senses; it desires to lay the finger into the print of his nails and to thrust the hand into his side, before it exclaim in humble adoration: "My Lord and my God."†

---

* Ullmann, *Suendlosigkeit Jesu*, 6th ed. p. 215: "So führt schon das Vollendet-Menschliche in Jesu, wenn wir es mit allem Uebrigen, was die Menschheit darbietet, vergleichen, zur Anerkennung des Göttlichen in ihm." Dorner, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, 2nd ed. vol. II. p. 1211: "Jesu Heiligkeit und Weisheit, durch die er unter den sündigen, viel-irrenden Menschen einzig dasteht, weiset . . . auf einen übernatürlichen Ursprung seiner Person. Diese muss, um inmitten der Sünderwelt begreiflich zu sein, aus einer eigenthümlichen und wunderbar schöpferischen That Gottes abgeleitet, ja es muss in Christus . . . von Gott aus betrachtet, eine Incarnation göttlicher Liebe, also göttlichen Wesens gesehen werden, was ihn als den Punkt erscheinen lässt, wo Gott und die Menschheit einzig und innigst geeinigt sind." Compare also Ebrard, *Christliche Dogmatik*, 1852, vol. II. p. 24–31.

† A Life of Christ written from this stand-point and rising from the humanity to the divinity of the Saviour, is yet a desideratum in our theological

It is from this point of view that we will endeavor, in as popular and concise a manner as the difficulty of the subject and the dignity of the occasion permit, to analyze and exhibit the human character of Christ. We propose to take up the man Jesus of Nazareth as he appears on the simple, unsophisticated record of the plain and honest fishermen of Galilee, and as he lives in the faith of Christendom, and we shall find him in all the stages of his life both as a private individual and as a public character so far elevated above the reach of successful rivalry and so singularly perfect that this very perfection in midst of an imperfect and sinful world constitutes an irresistible proof of his divinity.

A full discussion of the subject would require us to consider Christ in his official as well as personal character, and to describe him as a teacher, a reformer, a worker of miracles, and the founder of a spiritual kingdom universal in extent and perpetual in time. From every point of view

---

literature. But we have important contributions towards it, especially by three modern divines, a German, an English, and an American, which shows that this view of Christ forces itself upon the thinking minds of the three nations which now take the lead in Protestant theological science and literature. We refer to Dr. C. Ullmann: *Die Suendlosigkeit Jesu. Eine apologetische Betrachtung* (first published in the "*Studien und Kritiken*," 1828, Heft 1), 6th ed. Heidelberg, 1853 (translated into English by Lundin Brown: *The Sinlessness of Jesus: an Evidence of Christianity*. Edinburgh, 1858); John Young: *The Christ of History; an Argument grounded in the facts of his Life on earth*, republ. New York, 1856; and Horace Bushnell: *Nature and the Supernatural, as together constituting the one System of God*, New York, 1858; Chapter X and XI. p, 276–366. Compare also the beautiful Essay of the late Dr. James W. Alexander of New York, on the *Character of Jesus, an Argument for the Divine Origin of Christianity* (published in the "Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity delivered at the University of Virginia," New York, 1852, p. 193–211), and my *History of the Apostolic Church*, New York, 1853, (first in German at Mercersburg, 1851) p. 433 ff., and my *History of the Christian Church in the first three Centuries*, p. 53–59. It should be stated that the apologetic anti-Strauss literature on the Life of Jesus, especially Neander, Lange, Olshausen, Ebrard, Tholuck, Hoffmann, Schmid and Dorner, have brought out the ethical element and human perfection of Christ more fully than had been done before. The French works of E. Dandiran: *Essai sur la divinite du caractere moral de Jesus-Christ*, Genève, 1850, and of Edm. de Pressensé: *Le Redempteur*, Par., 1854, which seem to follow the same train of thought, we know only by name.

we would be irresistibly driven to the same result. But our present purpose confines us to the consideration of his personal character, and this alone, we think, is sufficient for the conclusion.

Christ passed through all the stages of human life from infancy to manhood, and represented each in its ideal form, that he might redeem and sanctify them all and be a perpetual model for imitation. He was the model infant, the model boy, the model youth, and the model man.* But the weakness, decline and decrepitude of old age would be incompatible with his character and mission. He died and rose in the full bloom of early manhood, and lives in the hearts of his people in unfading freshness and unbroken vigor for ever.

Let us first glance at the infancy and boyhood of the Saviour. The history of the race commences with the beauty of innocent youth in the garden of Eden, "when the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy," in beholding Adam and Eve created in the image of their Maker, the crowning glory of all his wonderful works. So the second Adam, the Redeemer of the fallen race, The Restorer and Perfecter of man, comes first before us in the accounts of the Gospels as a child born, not in paradise, it is true, but among the dreary ruins of sin and death, from an humble virgin, in a lowly manger,—yet pure and innocent, the subject of the praise of angels and

* This idea is almost as old as the Christian Church and was already pretty clearly taught by Irenaeus, who, through the single link of his teacher Polycarp, stood connected with the age of St. John the apostle. He says, *Adv. haereses*, lib. II. cap. 22. §. 4: "Omnes enim venit (Christus) per semetipsum salvare, omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes et parvulos et pueros et seniores. Ideo per omnom venit aetatem et infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes; in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes aetatem, simul et exemplum illis pietatis effectus et justitiae et subjectionis; in juvenibus juvenis, exemplum juvenibus fiens et sanctificans Domino. Sic et senior in senioribus (?), ut sit perfectus magister in omnibus," etc. But Irenaeus erred in carrying the idea too far and assuming Christ to have lived over fifty years, on the ground of the indefinite estimate of the Jews, John 8, 57. Hippolytus, in his recently discovered *Philosophumena*, expresses the same view.

the adoration of men. Heaven and earth, the Shepherds of Bethlehem in the name of Israel longing after salvation, and the Wise Men from the East as the representatives of heathenism in its dark groping after the "unknown God," unite in the worship of the new born King and Saviour. Here we meet at the very threshold of the earthly history of Christ that singular combination of humility and grandeur, of simplicity and sublimity, of the human and divine which characterizes it throughout, and distinguishes it from every other history. He is not represented as an unnatural prodigy, anticipating the maturity of a later age, but as a truly human child, silently lying and smiling on the bosom of his Virgin mother, "growing" and "waxing strong in spirit,"† and therefore subject to the law of regular development; yet differing from all other children by his supernatural conception and perfect freedom from hereditary sin and guilt. He appears in the celestial beauty of unspotted innocence, a veritable flower of paradise. He was "that Holy Thing," according to the announcement of the angel Gabriel, ‡ admired and loved by all who approached him in childlike spirit, but exciting the dark suspicion of the tyrant king who represented his future enemies and persecutors. Who can measure the ennobling, purifying and cheering influence which proceeds from the contemplation of the Christ-child at each returning Christmas season upon the hearts of young and old in every land and nation! The loss of the first estate is richly compensated by the undying innocence of paradise regained.

Of the boyhood of Jesus we know only one fact, recorded by Luke, but it is in perfect keeping with the peculiar charm of his childhood and forshadows at the same time the glory of his public life, as one uninterrupted service of his heavenly Father.‖ When twelve years old we find him

---

† Luke 2, 40. Comp. 2, 52. Heb. 2, 10–18 and 5, 8 and 9, where it is said, that he *learned* obedience, and being made perfect he *became* the author of eternal salvation. ‡ Luke 1, 35.

‖ Dr. J. P. Lange, in his *Leben Jesu nach den Evangelien*, Heidelberg, 1844, sqq. vol. II. p. 127, says: Die Geschichte des zwölfjährigen Jesu repräsentirt

in the temple in the midst of the Jewish doctors, not teaching and offending them, as in the apocryphal Gospels, by any immodesty or forwardness, but hearing and asking questions, thus actually learning from them; and yet filling them with astonishment at his understanding and answers. There is nothing premature, forced or unbecoming his age, and yet a degree of wisdom and an intensity of interest in religion which rises far above a purely human youth. "He increased," we are told, "in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man;"§ he was subject to his parents and practised all the virtues of an obedient son; and yet he filled them with a sacred awe as they saw him absorbed in "the things of his Father," ¶ and heard him utter words, which they were unable to understand at the time, but which Mary treasured up in her heart as a holy secret, convinced that they must have some deep meaning answering to the mystery of his supernatural conception and birth.

Such an idea of a harmless and faultless heavenly childhood, of a growing, learning, and yet surprisingly wise boyhood, as it meets us in living reality at the portal of the Gospel history, never entered the imagination of biographer, poet, or philosopher before. On the contrary, as has been justly observed by an able American divine,* "in all

---

seine ganze Entwicklung. Sie ist seine charakterische Knabenthat, die Offenbarung seines jugendlichen Lebens; ein Wiederglanz der Herrlichkeit seiner Geburt, ein Vorzeichen seines zukünftigen Heldenlaufes Sie stellt die Kindheit seiner Idealität dar; desswegen auch die Idealität der Kindheit überhaupt." Compare also the suggestive remarks of Olshausen to that passage *Commentar*, (3rd Germ. ed.) vol. I. p. 145 ff. §Luke 2, 52.

¶ Luke 2, 49: ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ, (the δεῖ indicates a *moral* necessity which is identical with true freedom) εἶναι με. The fathers and most of the modern commentators refer the τοῖς to the *house* of God, or the temple. This is grammatically allowable, but restricts the sense and deprives it of its deeper meaning. For he could only occasionally be in the temple of Jerusalem. Nearly all the English versions, Tyndal, Cranmer, Geneva, and James, translate more correctly "about my father's business." But we object to the *business* in this connection, and prefer the more literal translation "*in* (not *about*) *the things* (or affairs) of my Father." The *in* signifies the life element in which Christ moved during his whole life, whether in the temple or out of it.

* Horace Bushnell, in his genial work already quoted, on *Nature and the Supernatural*, p. 280.

the higher ranges of character, the excellence portrayed is never the simple unfolding of a harmonious and perfect beauty contained in the germ of childhood, but it is a character formed by a process of rectification in which many follies are mended and distempers removed, in which confidence is checked by defeat, passion moderated by reason, smartness sobered by experience. Commonly a certain pleasure is taken in showing how the many wayward sallies of the boy are, at length, reduced by discipline to the character of wisdom, justice, and public heroism so much admired. Besides, if any writer, of almost any age, will undertake to describe, not merely a spotless, but a superhuman or celestial childhood, not having the reality before him, he must be somewhat more than human himself, if he does not pile together a mass of clumsy exaggerations, and draw and overdraw, till neither heaven nor earth can find any verisimilitude in the picture."

This unnatural exaggeration, into which the mythical fancy of man, in its endeavor to produce a superhuman childhood and boyhood, will inevitably fall, is strikingly exhibited in the apocryphal Gospels, which are related to the canonical Gospels as the counterfeit to the genuine coin, or as a revolting caricature to the inimitable original, but which by the very contrast tend, negatively, to corroborate the truth of the evangelical history. While the evangelists expressly reserve the performance of miracles to the age of maturity and public life, and observe a significant silence concerning the parents of Jesus, the pseudo-evangelists fill the infancy and early years of the Saviour and his mother with the strangest prodigies, and make the active intercession of Mary very prominent throughout. According to their representation, even dumb idols, irrational beasts, and senseless trees, bow in adoration before the infant Jesus on his journey to Egypt, and after his return, when yet a boy of five or seven years, he changes balls of clay into flying birds for the idle amusement of his playmates, strikes terror round about him, dries up a stream of water by a mere word, transforms his

companions into goats, raises the dead to life, and performs all sorts of miraculous cures through a magical influence which proceeds from the very water in which he was washed, the towels which he used, and the bed on which he slept.* Here we have the falsehood and absurdity of unnatural fiction, while the New Testament presents us the truth and beauty of a supernatural, yet most real history which shines out only in brighter colors by the contrast of the mythical shadow.

With the exception of these few but significant hints, the youth of Jesus and the preparation for his public ministry are enshrined in mysterious silence. But we know the outward condition and circumstances, under which he grew up; and these must be admitted to furnish no explanation for the astounding results without the admission of the supernatural and divine element in his life.

He grew up among a people seldom and only contemptuously named by the ancient classics, and subjected at the time to the yoke of a foreign oppressor; in a remote and conquered province of the Roman empire; in the darkest district of Palestine; in a little country town of proverbial insignificance; in poverty and manual labor, in the obscurity of a carpenter's shop; far away from universities, academies, libraries, and literary or polished society; without any help, as far as we know, except the parental care, the book of nature, the Old Testament Scriptures, and the secret intercourse of his soul with God the heavenly Father. Hence the question of Nathanael: "What good can come out of Nazareth?" Hence the natural surprise of the Jews, who knew all his human relations and antecedents. "How knoweth this man letters," they asked, when they heard Jesus teach, "having never learned?" † And on another occasion, when he taught in the synagogue: "Whence hath this man this wisdom and these mighty works? Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother

* See the particulars with ample quotations from the sources in Rud. Hofmann's *Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen im Zusammenhang aus den Quellen erzaehlt und wissenschaftlich untersucht.* Leipzig, 1851. p. 140—263.

† John 7, 15.

called Mary? and his brethren, James and Joses and Simon and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this man all these things?" * These questions are unavoidable and unanswerable if Christ be regarded a mere man. For each effect presupposes a corresponding cause.

The difficulty here presented can by no means be solved by a reference to the fact that many, perhaps the majority of great men, especially in the Church, have risen by their own industry and perseverance from the lower walks of life and from a severe contest with poverty and obstacles of every kind. The fact itself is readily conceded; but in every one of these cases schools, or books, or patrons and friends, or peculiar events and influences, can be pointed out, as auxiliary aids in the development of intellectual or moral greatness. There is always some human or natural cause, or combination of causes, which accounts for the final result.

Luther, for instance, was, indeed, the son of poor peasants and had a very hard youth, but yet he went to the schools of Mansfeld, Magdeburg and Eisenach, to the University of Erfurt, passed through the ascetic discipline of convent life, lived in a university surrounded by professors, students and libraries, and was innocently as it were made a reformer by extraordinary events and the irresistible current of his age.

Shakspeare is generally and justly regarded as the most remarkable and almost wonderful example of a self-taught man, who without the regular routine of school education became the greatest dramatic poet of all times. But the absurd idea that the son of the Warwickshire yeoman, or butcher, or glover—we hardly know which—was essentially an unlearned man, and jumped with one bound from the supposed but poorly authenticated youthful folly of deer-stealing to the highest position in literature, has long since

* Matth. 13, 54—56. Comp. also Mark 6, 3. "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary," etc., from which it would appear that Jesus himself engaged in the trade of Joseph.

been abandoned. It is certain that he spent several years in the free grammar school of Stratford upon-Avon, where he probably acquired the "small Latin and less Greek" which, however small in the eyes of so profound a scholar as Ben Johnson, was certainly large enough to make the fortune of any enterprising young Yankee. And whatever were the defects of his training, he must have made them up by intense private study of books and the closest observation of man and things. For his dramas—the occasional chronological, historical and geographical mistakes notwithstanding, which are small matters at all events, and in most cases, as in "Pericles" and in "Midsummer Night's Dream," intentional or mere freaks of fancy—abound in the most accurate and comprehensive knowledge of human nature under all its types and conditions, in the cold north and the sunny south, in the fifteenth century and at the time of Cæsar, under the influence of Christianity and of Judaism, together with a great variety of historical and other information which cannot be acquired without immense industry and the help of oral or written instruction.* Moreover he lived in the city of London, united the offices of actor, manager and writer, in the classic age of Elizabeth, during the closing scenes of the greatest upheaving of the human mind which ever took place since the introduction of Christianity, in the company of genial and gifted friends, and with free access to the highest ranks of blood, wealth and wit.

In the case of Christ no such natural explanation can be given. All the attempts to bring him into contact with Egyptian wisdom, or the Essenic theosophy, or other sources of learning, are without a shadow of proof, and explain nothing after all. For, unlike all other great men, even the prophets and the apostles, he was absolutely original and independent. He taught the world as one who had

* Comp. G. G. Gervinus: *Shakspeare*, Leipzig, 1850, vol. i. p. 38—41. This masterly critic and expounder of the British poet pronounces him one of the best and most extensively informed men of his age: "Es ist heute kein Wagniss mehr, zu sagen, dass Shakspeare in jener Zeit an Umfang vielfachen Wissens sehr wenige seines Gleichen gehabt habe."

learned nothing from it and was under no obligation to it. "His character and life were originated and sustained in spite of circumstances with which no earthly force could have contended, and therefore must have had their real foundation in a force which was preternatural and divine."* At the same time it is easy to see, from the admission of Christ's divinity, that by this condescension he has raised humble origin, poverty, manual labor, and the lower orders of society, to a dignity and sacredness never known before, and has revolutionized the false standard of judging the value of men and things from their outward appearance, and of associating moral worth with social elevation, and moral degradation with low rank.

We now approach the public life of Jesus. In his thirtieth year, after the Messianic inauguration through the baptism by John as his immediate forèrunner and personal representative of the Old Testament, both in its legal, and prophetic or evangelical aspect, and after the Messianic probation by the temptation in the wilderness—the counterpart of the temptation of the first Adam in paradise—he entered upon his great work.

His public life lasted only three years, and before he had reached the age of ordinary maturity, he died, in the full beauty and vigor of early manhood, without tasting the infirmities of declining years, which would inevitably mar the picture of the Regenerator of the race and the Prince of life. And yet, unlike all other men of his years, he combined with the freshness, energy and originating power of youth that wisdom, moderation and experience, which belong only to mature age. The short triennium of his public ministry contains more, even from a purely historical point of observation, than the longest life of the greatest and best of men. It is pregnant with the deepest meaning of the counsel of God and the destiny of the race. It is the ripe fruit of all preceding ages, the fulfilment of the hopes and desires of the Jewish and heathen mind, and the fruit-

* John Young, *The Christ of History*, p. 35.

ful germ of succeeding generations, containing the impulse to the purest thoughts and noblest actions down to the end of time. It is, "the end of a boundless past, the centre of a boundless present, and the beginning of a boundless future."*

How remarkable, how wonderful this contrast between the short duration, and the immeasurable significance of Christ's ministry! The Saviour of the world a youth!

Other men require a long succession of years to mature their minds and character and to make a lasting impression upon the world. There are exceptions, we admit. Alexander the Great, the last and most brilliant efflorescence of the ancient Greek nationality, died a young man of thirty three after having conquered the East to the borders of the Indus. But who would think of comparing an ambitious warrior, conquered by his own lust and dying a victim of his passion, with the spotless friend of sinners; a few bloody victories of the one with the peaceful triumphs of the other; and a huge military empire of force which crumbled to pieces as soon as it was erected, with the spiritual kingdom of truth and love which stands to this day and will last for ever? Nor should it be forgotten that the true significance and only value of Alexander's conquest lay beyond the horizon of his ambition and intention, and that by carrying the language and civilization of Greece to Asia and bringing together the Oriental and Occidental world, it prepared the way for the introduction of the universal religion of Christ.

There is another striking distinction of a general character between Christ and the heroes of history, which we must notice here. We should naturally suppose that such an uncommon personage, setting up the most astounding claims and proposing the most extraordinary work, would surround himself with extraordinary circumstances and maintain a position far above the vulgar and degraded multi-

* Heinrich Steffens, a follower of Schelling, says this of man, and bases upon this thought his System of Anthropology. But it may be applied in its fullest and absolute sense to Christ, as the ideal man, in whom and through whom alone the race can become complete.

tude around him. We should expect something uncommon and striking in his look, his dress, his manner, his mode of speech, his outward life, and the train of his attendants. But the very reverse is the case. His greatness is singularly unostentatious, modest and quiet, and far from repelling the beholder, it attracts and invites him to familiar approach. His public life never moved on the imposing arena of secular heroism, but within the humble circle of every day life, and the simple relations of a son, a brother, a citizen, a teacher and a friend. He had no army to command, no kingdom to rule, no prominent station to fill, no worldly favors and rewards to dispense. He was an humble individual, without friends and patrons in the Sanhedrim or at the court of Herod. He never mingled in familiar intercourse with the religious or social leaders of the nation, whom he had startled in his twelfth year by his questions and answers. He selected his disciples from among the illiterate fishermen of Galilee and promised them no reward in this world but a part in the bitter cup of his sufferings. He dined with publicans and sinners and mingled with the common people, without ever condescending to their low manners and habits. He was so poor that he had no place on which to rest his head. He depended for the supply of his modest wants on voluntary contributions of a few pious females, and the purse was in the hands of a thief and a traitor. Nor had he learning, art, or eloquence, in the usual sense of the term, nor any other kind of power, by which great men arrest the attention and secure the admiration of the world. The writers of Greece and Rome were ignorant even of his existence until, several years after the crucifixion, the effects of his mission in the steady growth of the sect of his followers forced from them some contemptuous notice and then roused them to opposition.

And yet this Jesus of Nazareth without money and arms conquered more millions than Alexander, Cæsar, Mahomet, and Napoleon; without science and learning he shed more light on things human and divine than all philosophers

and scholars combined; without the eloquence of schools he spoke words of life as were never spoken before or since, and produced effects which lie beyond the reach of orator or poet; without writing a single line he has set more pens in motion and furnished themes for more sermons, orations, discussions, learned volumes, works of art and sweet songs of praise than the whole army of great men of ancient and modern times. Born in a manger, and crucified as a malefactor, he now controls the destinies of the civilized world, and rules a spiritual empire which embraces one third of the inhabitants of the globe. There never was in this world a life so unpretending, modest and lowly in its outward form and condition, and yet producing such extraordinary effects upon all ages, nations and classes of men. The annals of history produce no other example of such complete and astounding success in spite of the absence of those material, social, literary and artistic powers and influences which are indispensable to success for a mere man. Christ stands also in this respect solitary and alone among all the heroes of history, and presents to us an insolvable problem, unless we admit him to be the eternal Son of God.

We will now attempt to describe his personal or moral and religious character, as it appears in the record of his public life, and then examine his own testimony of himself, as giving us the only rational solution of this mighty problem.

The first impression which we receive from the life of Jesus is that of its perfect innocency and sinlessness inmidst of a sinful world. He and He alone carried the spotless purity of childhood untarnished through his youth and manhood. Hence the lamb and the dove are his appropriate symbols.

He was, indeed, tempted as we are, but he never yielded to temptation.* His sinlessness was at first only the *rela-*

* Comp. with the history of the temptation in the wilderness, Matth. 4 and Luke 4, the significant passages in the epistle to the Hebrews, 4, 15: *πεπειραμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα, χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*' and 5, 8: *καίπερ ὢν υἱός, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν.*

tive sinlessness of Adam before the fall, which implies the necessity of trial and temptation and the peccability, or the possibility of the fall. Had he been endowed with absolute impeccability from the start, he could not be a true man, nor our model for imitation, his holiness instead of being his own self-acquired act and merit would be a mechanical gift, and his temptation an unreal show. But here is the great fundamental difference between the first and the second Adam: the first Adam lost his innocence by the abuse of his freedom and fell by his own act of disobedience into the dire necessity of sin, while the second Adam was innocent in the midst of sinners and maintained his innocence against all and every temptation. Christ's relative sinlessness or the *posse non peccare* became more and more *absolute* sinlessness or a *non posse peccare*, by his own moral act or the right use of his freedom in the absolute active and passive obedience to God.

In vain we look through the entire biography of Christ for a single stain or the slightest shadow on his moral character. There never lived a more harmless being on earth. He injured nobody, he took advantage of nobody. He never spoke an improper word, he never committed a wrong action. He never repented, never asked God for pardon and forgiveness.† He stood in no need of regeneration and conversion, nor even of reform, but simply of the regular harmonious unfolding of his moral powers. He exhibited a uniform elevation above the objects, opinions, pleasures and passions of this world, and disregard to riches, displays, fame and favor of men. The apparent outbreak of passion in the expulsion of the profane traffickers from the temple is the only instance on the record of his history which might be quoted against his freedom from the faults of humanity. But the very effect which it produced, shows that far from being the

† The petition for forgiveness in the Lord's Prayer, Matth. 6, 12, is no exception, as it was no expression of individual need on his part, but was intended as a model for his disciples.

outburst of passion, the expulsion was a judicial act of a religious reformer, vindicating in just and holy zeal the honor of the Lord of the temple, and that with a dignity and majesty which at once silenced the offenders, though superior in number and physical strength, and made them submit to their well deserved punishment without a murmur and in awe of the presence of a superhuman power. The cursing of the unfruitful fig tree can still less be urged, as it evidently was a significant symbolical act foreshadowing the fearful doom of the impenitent Jews in the destruction of Jerusalem.

The perfect innocence of Jesus, however, is based not only negatively on the absence of any recorded word or act to the contrary and his absolute exemption from every trace of selfishness and worldliness, but, positively also on the unanimous testimony of John the Baptist and the apostles who bowed before the majesty of his character in unbounded veneration and declare him "just," "holy," and "without sin."* It is admitted, moreover, by his enemies: the heathen judge Pilate, and his wife, representing as it were the Roman law and justice when they shuddered with apprehension and washed the hands to be clear of innocent blood; by the rude Roman centurion confessing under the cross in the name of the disinterested spectators, "Truly this was the Son of God," and by Judas himself, the immediate witness of his whole public and private life, exclaiming in despair: "I have betrayed innocent blood."† Even dumb nature responded in mysterious sympathy, and

---

* Acts 3, 14. 1 Peter 1, 19; 2, 22; 3, 18. 2 Cor. 5, 21; 1 John 2, 29; 3, 5. 7. Heb. 4, 15; 7, 26. Considering the infinite superiority of the ethics of the apostles to the ethics of the ancient Greeks it is absurd to weaken the force of this unanimous testimony (as is done by D. F. Strauss, *Die christliche Glaubenslehre*, Vol. II. p. 192, and to some extent even by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 61), by a reference to Xenophon's estimate of Socrates: *Οὐδεὶς πώποτε Σωκράτους οὐδὲν ἀσεβὲς οὐδὲ ἀνόσιον οὔτε πράττοντος εἶδεν, οὔτε λέγοντος ἤκουσεν.* Memorab. I. 11. Comp. the just remarks of Ullmann, *Suendlosigkeit Jesu*, p. 83 ff.

† Matth. 27, 19; 24–54. Luke 23, 22–47. Matth. 27, 4.

the beclouded heavens above and the shaking earth beneath united in paying their unconscious tribute to the divine purity of their dying Lord. It is finally placed beyond all possibility of doubt by his own freedom from any sense of guilt or unworthiness, and by his open and fearless challenge to his bitter enemies: "Which of you convinceth me of sin?"‡ In this question he clearly exempts himself from the common fault and guilt of the race. In the mouth of any other man this question would at once betray either the hight of hypocrisy, or a degree of self-deception bordering on madness itself, and would overthrow the very foundation of all human goodness; while from the mouth of Jesus we instinctively receive it as the triumphant self-vindication of one, who stood far above the possibility of successful impeachment or founded suspicion.‖

Admit once this fact of the perfect sinlessness of Christ, as is done even by divines who are by no means regarded orthodox,§ and you admit that Christ differed from all other

‡ John 8, 46. Comp. the Commentators, and the reflections of Ullmann, l. c. p. 92 ff.

‖ Compare the striking remarks of H. Bushnell, p. 325: "If Jesus was a sinner, he was conscious of sin as all sinners are, and therefore was a hypocrite in the whole fabric of his character; realizing so much of divine beauty in it, maintaining the show of such unfaltering harmony and celestial grace, and doing all this with a mind confused and fouled by the affectations acted for true virtues! Such an example of successful hypocrisy would be itself the greatest miracle ever heard of in the world."

§ As Schleiermacher, *Der Christliche Glaube*, 3d ed. (1836) vol. ii. p. 78: "Christus war von allen andern Menschen unterschieden durch seine wesentliche Unsündlichkeit und seine schlechthinige Vollkommenheit." Karl Hase, *Leben Jesu*, 4th ed. 1854, p. 60 f. (Clarke's Eng. translation, Boston, 1860, p. 54) likewise admits it. D. F. Strauss denies it in his two destructive works, the *Life of Jesus*, and the *Dogmatics in conflict with Modern Science*, but he does so from the a priori philosophical argument of the impossibility of sinlessness, or the pantheistic notion of the inseparableness of sin from all finite existence. The only exegetical proof he urges (Dogmat. ii. 192), is Christ's word, Matth. 19, 17: "There is none good but one, that is God." But Christ answers here to the preceding question and the implied misconception of goodness. He does not decline the epithet *good* as such, but only in the superficial sense of the rich youth who regarded him simply as a distinguished rabbi and a good *man*, not as one with God. In no case can he be supposed to have contradicted his own testimony concerning his innocence. See the commentators *ad locum*, especially Olshausen, Meyer and Lange.

men not in degree only, but in kind. For although we must repudiate the pantheistic notion of the necessity of sin, and must maintain that human nature in itself considered is capable of sinlessness, that it was sinless in fact before the fall, and that it will ultimately become sinless again by the redemption of Christ: yet it is equally certain that human nature in its *present* condition is not and never was sinless since the fall, except in the single case of Christ, and that for this very reason Christ's sinlessness can only be explained on the ground of such an extraordinary indwelling of God in him as never took place in any other human being before or after. The entire Christian world, Greek, Latin, and Protestant, agree in the scriptural doctrine of the universal depravity of human nature since the apostacy of the first Adam. Even the modern and unscriptural Romish dogma of the freedom of the Virgin Mary from hereditary as well as actual sin, can hardly be quoted as an exception: for her sinlessness is explained in the papal decision by the assumption of a miraculous interposition of divine favor and the reflex influence of the merit of her Son. There is not a single mortal who must not charge himself with some defect or folly, and man's consciousness of sin and unworthiness deepens just in proportion to his self-knowledge and progress in virtue and goodness. There is not a single saint who has not experienced a new birth from above and an actual conversion from sin to holiness, and who does not feel daily the need of repentance and divine forgiveness. The very greatest and best of them, as St. Paul and St. Augustin, have passed through a violent struggle and a radical revolution, and their whole theological system and religious experience rested on the felt antithesis of sin and grace.

But in Christ we have the one solitary and absolute exception to this universal rule, an individual thinking like a man, feeling like a man, speaking, acting, suffering and dying like a man, surrounded by sinners in every direction, with the keenest sense of sin and the deepest sympathy with sinners, commencing his public ministry with the

call: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," *— yet never touched in the least by the contamination of the world, never putting himself in the attitude of a sinner before God, never shedding a tear of repentance, never regretting a single thought, word or deed, never needing or asking divine pardon, and boldly facing all his present and future enemies in the absolute certainty of his spotless purity before God and man!

A sinless Saviour inmidst of a sinful world is an astounding fact indeed, and a miracle in history. But this freedom from the common sin and guilt of the race is after all only the negative side of his character, which rises in magnitude as we contemplate the positive side, namely, absolute moral and religious perfection. It is universally admitted, even by Deists and Rationalists, that Christ taught the purest and sublimest system of ethics, which throws all the moral precepts and maxims of the wisest men of antiquity far into the shade. The Sermon on the Mount alone is worth infinitely more than all that Confucius, Socrates, and Seneca ever said or wrote on duty and virtue. But the difference is still greater if we come to the more difficult task of practice. While the wisest and best of men never live up even to their own imperfect standard of excellency, Christ fully carried out his perfect doctrine in his life and conduct. He is the living incarnation of the ideal standard of virtue and holiness, and universally acknowledged to be the highest model for all that is pure and good and noble in the sight of God and man.

We find Christ moving in all the ordinary and essential relations of life,† as a son, a friend, a citizen, a teacher, at home and in public; we find him among all classes of society, with sinners and saints, with the poor and the wealthy, with the sick and the healthy, with little children, grown men and women, with plain fishermen and learned scribes,

---

* Matth. 4, 17.

† The relation of husband and father must be excepted on account of his elevation above all equal partnership and the universalness of his character and mission, which requires the entire community of the redeemed as his bride instead of any individual daughter of Eve.

with despised publicans and honored members of the Sanhedrim, with friends and foes, with admiring disciples and bitter persecutors, now with an individual as Nicodemus, or the woman of Samaria, now in the familiar circle of the twelve, now in the crowds of the people; we find him in all situations, in the synagogue and the temple, at home and on journeys, in villages and the city of Jerusalem, in the desert and on the mountain, along the banks of Jordan and the shores of the Galilean sea, at the wedding feast and the grave, in Gethsemane, in the judgment hall and on Calvary. In all these various relations, conditions and situations, as they are crowded within the few years of his public ministry, he sustains the same consistent character throughout, without ever exposing himself to censure. He fulfils every duty to God, to man, and to himself, without a single violation of duty, and exhibits an entire conformity to the law, in the spirit as well as the letter. His life is one unbroken service of God in active and passive obedience to his holy will, one grand act of absolute love to God and love to man, of personal self-consecration to the glory of the heavenly Father and the salvation of a fallen race. In the language of the people who were "beyond measure astonished at his works," we must say, the more we study his life: "He did all things well."* In a solemn appeal to his heavenly Father in the parting hour, he could proclaim to the world that he had glorified him in the earth and finished the work he gave him to do.†

The first feature in this singular perfection of Christ's character which strikes our attention, is the perfect harmony of virtue and piety, of morality and religion, or of love to God and love to man. Every moral action in him proceeded from supreme love to God, and looked to the temporal and eternal welfare of man. The groundwork of his character was the most intimate and uninterrupted

---

* Mark 7, 37: Καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκε, bene omnia fecit—is to be taken as a general judgment, inferred not only from the concrete case related before, but from all they had heard and seen of Christ.

† John 17; 3. 22.

union and communion with his heavenly Father, from whom he derived, to whom he referred every thing. Already in his twelfth year he found his life element and delight in the things of his Father.* It was his daily food to do the will of Him that sent him and to finish his work.† To him he looked in prayer before every important act, and taught his disciples that model prayer which, for simplicity, brevity, comprehensiveness and suitableness, can never be surpassed. He often retired to a mountain or solitary place for prayer, and spent days and nights in this blessed privilege. But so constant and uniform was his habit of communion with the great Jehovah, that he kept it up amid the multitude, and converted the crowded city into a religious retreat. His self-consciousness was at every moment conditioned, animated and impregnated by the consciousness of God. Even when he exclaimed in indescribable anguish of body and soul, and in vicarious sympathy with the misery of the whole race: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!" ‡ the bond of union was not broken or even loosened, but simply obscured for a moment, as the sun by a passing cloud, and the enjoyment, not the possession of it, was withdrawn from his feelings; for immediately afterwards he commended his soul into the hands of his Father and triumphantly exclaimed: "It is finished!" So strong and complete was this moral union of Christ with God at every moment of his life, that he fully realized for the first time the idea of religion whose object is to bring about such a union, and that he is the personal representative and living embodiment of Christianity as the true and absolute religion. But the piety of Christ was no inactive contemplation, or retiring mysticism, and selfish enjoyment, but thoroughly practical, ever active in works of charity, and tending to regenerate and transform the world into the kingdom of

* Luke 2, 49. † John 4, 34, comp. 5, 30.

‡ Matth. 27, 46. It should be remembered, that Jesus speaks here in the prophetical and typical words of David, Ps. 22, 2; while, when speaking in his own language, he uniformly addresses God as his *Father*.

God. "He went about doing good." His life is an unbroken series of good words and virtues in active exercise, all proceeding from the same union with God, animated by the same love, and tending to the same end, the glory of God and the happiness of man.

The next feature, we would notice, is the completeness or pleromatic fulness of the moral and religious character of Christ. While all other men represent at best but broken fragments of the idea of goodness and holiness, he exhausts the list of virtues and graces, which may be named.

History exhibits to us many examples of commanding and comprehensive geniuses, who stand at the head of their age and nation and furnish material for the intellectual activity of whole generations and periods, until they are succeeded by other heroes at a new epoch of development. As rivers generally spring from high mountains, so knowledge and moral power rises and is continually nourished from the heights of humanity. Abraham, the father of the faithful; Moses, the lawgiver of the Jewish theocracy; Elijah among the prophets; Peter, Paul and John among the apostles; Athanasius and Chrysostom among the Greek, Augustin and Jerome among the Latin fathers; Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus among the schoolmen; Leo and Gregory among the popes; Luther and Calvin in the line of protestant reformers and divines; Socrates, the patriarch of the ancient schools of philosophy; Homer, Dante, Shakspeare and Milton, Goethe and Schiller in the history of poetry among the various nations to which they belong; Raphael among painters; Charlemagne, the first and greatest in the long succesion of German emperors; Napoleon, towering high above all the generals of his training: Washington, the wisest and best as well as the first of American Presidents and the purest and noblest type of the American character, may be mentioned as examples of such representative heroes in history who anticipate and concentrate the powers of whole generations. But they never represent universal, but only sectional humanity; they are identified with a particular people or age and partake of its errors,

superstitions and failings almost in the same proportion in which they exhibit their virtues. Moses, though revered by the followers of three religions, was a Jew in views, feelings, habits and position as well as by parentage; Socrates never rose above the Greek type of character; Luther was a German to the back-bone and can only be properly understood as a German; Calvin, though an exile from his native land, remained a Frenchman; and Washington can be to no nation on earth what he is to the American. Their influence may and does extend far beyond their respective national horizon, yet they can never furnish a universal model for imitation. We regard them as extraordinary but fallible and imperfect men, whom it would be very unsafe to follow in every view and line of conduct. Very frequently the failings and vices of great men are in proportion to their virtues and powers, as the tallest bodies cast the longest shadow. Even the three leading apostles are models of piety and virtue only as far as they reflect the image of their heavenly Master, and it is only with this qualification that Paul exhorts his spiritual children: "Be ye followers of me even as I am also of Christ-"*

What these representative men are to particular ages or nations, or sects, or particular schools of science and art, Christ was to the human family at large in its relation to God. He and he alone is the universal type for universal imitation. Hence he could, without the least impropriety or suspicion of vanity, call upon all men to forsake all things and to follow him.† He stands above the limitations of age, school, sect, nation, and race. Although a Jew according to the flesh, there is nothing Jewish about him which is not at the same time of general significance. The particular and national in him is always duly subordinated to the general and human. Still less was he ever identified with a party or sect. He was equally removed from the stiff formalism of the Pharisees, the loose liberal-

* 1 Cor. 11, 1. Comp. 1 Thess. 1, 6: "Ye became followers of us and of the Lord."

† Matth 4, 19. 8, 22. 9, 9 Mark 2, 14. 8, 34. 10, 21. Luke 5, 27. 9, 23. 59. 18. 22. John 1, 43. 10, 27. 12, 26.

ism of the Sadducees, and the inactive mysticism of the Essenes. He rose above all the prejudices, bigotries and superstitions of his age and people, which exert their power even upon the strongest and otherwise most liberal minds. Witness his freedom in the observance of the sabbath, by which he offended the scrupulous literalists, while he fulfilled, as the Lord of the sabbath, the true spirit of the law in its universal and abiding significance;‡ his reply to the disciples, when they traced the misfortune of the blind man to a particular sin of the subject or his parents;‖ his liberal conduct towards the Samaritans as contrasted with the inveterate hatred and prejudice of the Jews including his own disciples at the time;¶ and his charitable judgment of the slaughtered Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, and the eighteen upon whom the tower in Siloam fell and slew them.** "Think ye," he addressed the children of superstition, "that these men were sinners above all the Galileans, and above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem, because they suffered such things? I tell you, Nay: but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." All the words and all the actions of Christ, while they were fully adapted to the occasions which called them forth, retain their force and applicability undiminished to all ages and nations. He is the same unsurpassed and unsurpassable model of every virtue to the Christians of every generation, every clime, every sect, every nation, and every race.

It must not be supposed, however, that a complete catalogue of virtues would do justice to the character under consideration. It is not only the completeness, but still more the even proportion and perfect harmony of virtues and graces apparently opposite and contradictory, which

‡ Matth. 12, 1–8. Mark 2, 23.–28. Luke 5, 1–9. John 5, 16–18.

‖ John 9, 3: "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents, (but he was born blind) that the works of God should be made manifest in him."

¶ See the dialogue with the woman of Samaria, John 4, 5 ff., and the parable of the merciful Samaritan, Luke 10, 30–37.

** Luke 13, 1–4.

distinguishes him specifically from all other men. This feature has struck with singular force all the more eminent writers on the subject."* It gives the finish to that beauty of holiness which is the sublimest picture presented to our contemplation.

He was free from all one-sidedness which constitutes the weakness as well as the strength of the most eminent men. He was not a man of one idea nor of one virtue towering above all the rest. The moral forces were so well tempered and moderated by each other that none was unduly prominent, none carried to excess, none alloyed by the kindred failing. Each was checked and completed by the opposite grace. His character never lost its even balance and happy equilibrium, never needed modification or readjustment. It was thoroughly sound and uniformly consistent from the beginning to the end. We cannot properly attribute to him any one temperament. He was neither sanguine, like Peter, nor choleric, like Paul, nor melancholic like John, nor phlegmatic as James is sometimes, though incorrectly, represented to have been, but he combined the vivacity without the levity of the sanguine, the vigor without the violence of the choleric, the seriousness without the austerity of the melancholic, the calmness without the apathy of the phlegmatic temperaments. He was equally far removed from the excesses of the legalist, the pietist, the ascetic, and the enthusiast. With the strictest obedience to the law he moved in the element of

* Comp. Ullmann, *Suendlosigkeit* p. 67, J. P. Lange, *Leben Jesu* I. 27–34, Ebrard, *Dogmatik* II. 23 and 24. Also Hase, in his *Leben Jesu* p. 63 (4th ed.) places the ideal beauty of Christ's character in "das schöne Ebenmaass aller Kräfte," and in "vollendete Gottesliebe dargestellt in reinster Humanität" ("the beautiful symmetry of all powers, and perfect love exhibited in purest humanity"). Bishop D. Wilson, in his *Evidences of Christianity*, vol. II. 116 (Boston ed. of 1830) remarks: "The opposite, and to us apparently contradictory graces were found in him in equal proportion." Dr. W. E. Channing, the Unitarian, in his sermon on the *Character of Christ* (Works, vol. IV. p. 23) says: "This combination of the spirit of humanity, in its lowliest, tenderest form, with the consciousness of unrivaled and divine glories, is the most wonderful distinction of this wonderful character."

freedom; with all the fervor of the enthusiast he was always calm, sober and self-possessed; notwithstanding his complete and uniform elevation above the affairs of this world, he freely mingled with society, male and female, dined with publicans and sinners, sat at the wedding feast, shed tears at the sepulchre, delighted in God's nature, admired the beauties of the lilies, and used the occupations of the husbandman for the illustration of the sublimest truths of the kingdom of heaven. His zeal never degenerated into passion or rashness, nor his constancy into obstinacy, nor his benevolence into weakness, nor his tenderness into sentimentality. His unworldliness was free from indifference and unsociability, his dignity from pride and presumption, his affability from undue familiarity, his self-denial from moroseness, his temperance from austerity. He combined child-like innocence with manly strength, all-absorbing devotion to God with untiring interest in the welfare of man, tender love to the sinner with uncompromising severity against sin, commanding dignity with winning humility, fearless courage with wise caution, unyielding firmness with sweet gentleness. He is justly compared with the lion in strength and with the lamb in meekness. He equally possessed the wisdom of the serpent and the simplicity of the dove. He brought both the sword against every form of wickedness, and the peace which the world cannot give. He was the most effective, and yet the least noisy, the most radical, and yet the most conservative, calm and patient of all reformers. He came to fulfil every letter of the law, and yet he made all things new. The same hand which drove the profane traffickers from the temple, blessed little children, healed the lepers, and rescued the sinking disciple; the same ear which heard the voice of approbation from heaven, was open to the cries of the woman in travail; the same mouth which pronounced the terrible woe on the hypocrites and condemned the impure desire and unkind feeling as well as the open crime, blessed the poor in spirit, announced pardon to the adulteress, and prayed for his murderers; the same eye which

beheld the mysteries of God and penetrated the heart of man shed tears of compassion over ungrateful Jerusalem, and tears of friendship at the grave of Lazarus. These are indeed opposite, yet not contradictory traits of character, as little as the different manifestations of God's power and goodness in the tempest and the sunshine, in the towering alps and the lily of the valley, in the boundless ocean and dew-drop of the morning. They are separated in imperfect men indeed, but united in Christ, the universal model for all.

Finally as all the active virtues meet in him, so he unites the active or heroic virtues with the passive and gentle. He is equally the highest standard of all true martyrdom.

No character can become complete without trial and suffering, and a noble death is the crowning act of a noble life. Edmund Burke said to Fox in the English Parliament: "Obloquy is a necessary ingredient of all true glory. Calumny and abuse are essential parts of triumph." The ancient Greeks and Romans admired a good man struggling with misfortune as a sight worthy of the gods. Plato describes the righteous man as one who without doing any injustice, yet has the appearance of the greatest injustice and proves his own justice by perseverance against all calumny unto death; yea he predicts that if such a righteous man should ever appear, he would be "scourged, tortured, bound, deprived of his sight, and after having suffered all possible injury nailed on a post."* No wonder that the ancient fathers saw in this remarkable passage an unconscious prophecy of Christ. But how far is this ideal of the great philosopher from the actual reality as it appeared three hundred years afterwards. The great men of this world, who rise even above themselves on inspiring occasions and boldly face a superior army, are often thrown off their equilibrium in ordinary life and grow impatient at trifling obstacles. Only think of Napoleon at the head of his conquering legions and at the helm of an empire, and

* Politia p. 74 sqq. ed. Ast. (Plat. Opera vol. IV.) p. 361 E. ed. Bip.

the same Napoleon after the defeat at Waterloo and on the island of St. Helena. The highest form of passive virtue attained by ancient heathenism or modern secular heroism is that stoicism which meets and overcomes the trials and misfortunes of life in the spirit of haughty contempt and unfeeling indifference, which destroys the sensibilities and is but another exhibition of selfishness and pride.

Christ has set up a far higher standard by his teaching and example, never known before or since, except in imperfect imitation of him. He has revolutionized moral philosophy and convinced the world that forgiving love to the enemy, holiness and humility, gentle patience in suffering and cheerful submission to the holy will of God is the crowning excellency of moral greatness. "If thy brother," he says, "trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him."* "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you."† This is a sublime maxim truly, but still more sublime is its actual exhibition in his life.

Christ's passive virtue is not confined to the closing scenes of his ministry. As human life is beset at every step by trials, vexations, and hindrances, which should serve the educational purpose of developing its resources and proving its strength, so was Christ's. During the whole state of his humiliation he was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,"‡ and had to endure "the contradiction of sinners."‖ He was poor, and suffered hunger and fatigue. He was tempted by the devil. His path was obstructed with apparently unsurmountable difficulties from the outset. His words and miracles called forth the bitter hatred of the world, which resulted at last in the bloody counsel of death. The Pharisees and Sadducees forgot their jealousies and quarrels in opposing him. They rejected and perverted his testimony; they laid snares to

* Luke 17, 4. † Matth. 5, 44. ‡ Isai. 50, 3. ‖ Heb 12, 3.

him by insiduous questions; they called him a glutton and a winebibber for eating and drinking like other men, a friend of publicans and sinners for his condescending love and mercy, a sabbath-breaker for doing good on the sabbath day; they charged him with madness and blasphemy for asserting his unity with the Father, and derived his miracles from Beelzebub, the prince of devils. The common people, though astonished at his wisdom and mighty works, pointed sneeringly at his origin; his own country and native town refused him the honor of a prophet. Even his brothers, we are told, did not believe in him, and in their impatient zeal for a temporal kingdom they found fault with his unostentatious proceeding.* His apostles and disciples, with all their profound reverence for his character and faith in his divine origin and mission as the Messiah of God, yet by their ignorance, their carnal Jewish notions and their almost habitual misunderstanding of his spiritual discourses, must have constituted a severe trial of patience to a teacher of far less superiority to his pupils.

But how shall we describe his passion more properly so called with which no other suffering can be compared for a moment! Never did any man suffer more innocently, more unjustly, more intensely, than Jesus of Nazareth. Within the narrow limits of a few hours we have here a tragedy of universal significance, exhibiting every form of human weakness and infernal wickedness, of ingratitude, desertion, injury and insult, of bodily and mental pain and anguish, culminating in the most ignominious death then known among the Jews and Gentiles. The government and the people combined against him who came to save them. His own disciples forsook him; Peter denied him; Judas, under the inspiration of the devil betrayed him. The rulers of the nation condemned him, the furious mob

* John 7, 3–5. It is immaterial for our purpose whether we understand by his brothers (not "brethren" as the Common Version has it) younger sons of Joseph and Mary, or older sons of Joseph from a former marriage, or cousins.

cried: "Crucify him!" rude soldiers mocked him. He was seized in the night, hurried from tribunal to tribunal, arrayed in a crown of thorns, insulted, smitten, scourged, spit upon and hung like a criminal and a slave between two robbers and murderers!

How did Christ bear all these little and great trials of life, and the death on the Cross? Let us remember first, that unlike the icy Stoics, in their unnatural and repulsive pseudo-virtue, he had the keenest sensibilities and the deepest sympathies with all human grief, that made him even shed tears at the grave of a friend and in the agony of the garden, and provide a refuge for his mother in the last dying hour. But with this truly human tenderness and delicacy of feeling, he ever combined an unutterable dignity and majesty, a sublime self-control and imperturbable calmness of mind. There is a grandeur in his deepest sufferings, which forbids a feeling of pity and compassion on our side as incompatible with the admiration and reverence for his character. We feel the force of his words to the women of Jerusalem, when they bewailed him on the way to Calvary: "Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and your children," &c. We never hear him break out in angry passion and violence, although he was at war with the whole ungodly world. He never murmured, never uttered discontent, displeasure or resentment. He was never disheartened, discouraged, ruffled or fretted, but full of unbounded confidence that all was well ordered in the providence of his heavenly Father. He moved serenely like the sun above the clouds as they sailed under him. He was ever surrounded by the element of peace, and said in his parting hour: "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." * He was never what we call unhappy, but full of inward joy which he bequeathed to his disciples in that sublimest of all prayers, "that they might have his joy fulfilled in

* John 14, 27.

themselves." † With all his severe rebuke to the Pharisees, he never indulged in personalities. He ever returned good for evil. He forgave Peter for his denial, and would have forgiven Judas, if in the exercise of sincere repentance he had sought his pardon. Even while hanging on the cross, he had only the language of pity for the wretches who were driving the nails into his hands and feet, and prayed in their behalf: "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." He did not seek or hasten his martyrdom, like many of the early martyrs of the Ignatian type in their morbid enthusiasm and ambitious humility, but quietly and patiently waited for the hour appointed by the will of his heavenly Father. But when it came, with what self-possession and calmness, with what strength and meekness, with what majesty and gentleness did he pass through its dark and trying scenes! Here every word and act are unnutterably significant, from the agony in Gethsemane, when overwhelmed with the sympathetic sense of the entire guilt of mankind, and in full view of the terrible scenes before him—the only guiltless being in the world—he prayed that the cup might pass from him, but immediately added: "Not my, but thy will be done," to the triumphant exclamation on the cross: "It is finished!" Even his dignified silence before the tribunal of his enemies and the furious mob, when "as a lamb dumb before his shearers he opened not his mouth," is more eloquent than any apology, and made Pilate tremble. Who will venture to bring a parallel from the annals of ancient or modern sages, when even a Rousseau confessed: "If Socrates suffered and died like a philosopher, Christ suffered and died like a God!" The passion and crucifixion of Jesus, like his whole character, stands without a parallel, solitary and alone in its glory, and will ever continue to be what it has been for these eighteen hundred years, the most sacred theme of meditation, the highest exemplar of suffering virtue, the strongest weapon

† John 17, 13, comp. 16, 33.

against sin and Satan, the deepest source of comfort to the noblest and best of men.

Such was Jesus of Nazareth—a true man in body, soul and spirit, yet differing from all men, a character abolutely unique and original from tender childhood to ripe manhood, moving in unbroken union with God, overflowing with the purest love to man, free from every sin and error, innocent and holy, teaching and practising all virtues in perfect harmony, devoted solely and uniformly to the noblest ends, sealing the purest life with the sublimest death, and ever acknowledged since as the one and only perfect model of goodness and holiness! All human greatness loses on closer inspection; but Christ's character grows more and more pure, sacred and lovely, the better we know him. No biographer, moralist, or artist can be satisfied with any attempt of his to set it forth. It is felt to be infinitely greater than any conception or representation of it by the mind, the tongue and the pencil of man or angel. We might as well attempt to empty the waters of the boundless sea into a narrow well, or to portray the splendor of the risen sun and the starry heavens with ink. No picture of the Saviour, though drawn by the masterhand of a Raphael, or Dürer, or Rubens; no epic, though conceived by the genius of a Dante, or Milton, or Klopstock, can improve on the artless narrative of the gospel, whose only but all-powerful charm is truth. In this case certainly truth is stranger and stronger than fiction, and speaks best for itself without comment, explanation and eulogy. Here and here alone the highest perfection of art falls short of the historical fact, and fancy finds no room for idealizing the real. For here we have the absolute ideal itself in living reality. It seems to me that this consideration alone should satisfy the reflecting mind that Christ's character, though truly natural and human, must be at the same time truly supernatural and divine.

The whole range of history and fiction furnishes no parallel to such a character. There never was any thing even

approaching to it before or since, except in faint imitation of his example. It cannot be explained on purely human principles, nor derived from any intellectual and moral forces of the age in which he lived. On the contrary it stands in marked contrast to the whole surrounding world of Judaism and heathenism, which present to us the dreary picture of internal decay, and which actually crumbled into ruin before the new moral creation of the crucified Jesus of Nazareth. He is the one absolute and unaccountable exception to the universal experience of mankind. He is the great central miracle of the whole gospel history, and all his miracles are but the natural and necessary manifestations of his miraculous person performed with the same ease with which we perform our ordinary daily works.

There is but one rational explanation of this sublime mystery, and this is found in Christ's own testimony concerning his superhuman and divine origin.* This testimony challenges at once our highest regard and belief from the absolute veracity which no one ever denied him or could deny without destroying at once the very foundation of his universally conceded moral purity and greatness.

Christ strongly asserts his humanity, and calls himself, in innumerable passages, the Son of man.† This expression, while it places him in one view on common ground with us as flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone, already indicates at the same time that he is more than an ordinary individual, not merely *a* son of man like all other descendants of Adam, but *the* Son of man, the man in the highest sense, the ideal, the universal, the absolute man, the second Adam descended from heaven, the head of a new and superior order of the race, the King of Israel, the Messiah. The same is the case with the cognate term, "the Son of David," which

* For a very full exposition of this testimony, we refer to the instructive and able work of W. Fr. Gess: *Die Lehre von der Person Christi entwickelt aus dem Selbstbewusstsein Christi und aus dem Zeugnisse der Apostel.* Basel, 1856.

† Comp. the Dictionaries, and especially Schmid's and Bagster's Greek Concordances of the N. T. (the latter republished by the Harpers, N. York, 1855) sub. v. ὑιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

is frequently given to Christ, by the two blind men, the Syrophenician woman, and the people at large.* The appellation does not express then, as many suppose, the humiliation and condescension of Christ simply, but his elevation rather above the ordinary level and the actualization in him and through him of the ideal standard of human nature under its moral and religious aspect or in its relation to God. This interpretation is suggested grammatically by the use of the definite article, and historically by the origin of the term in Daniel 7, 13, where it signifies the Messiah as the head of a universal and eternal kingdom. It commends itself moreover at once as the most natural and significant in such passages as: "Ye shall see the heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man"; † "He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven";‡ "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins"; § "The Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day"; ‖ "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you"; ¶ "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father";** "The Son of man is come to save"; †† "The Father hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man".‡‡ Even those passages which are quoted for the opposite view, receive, in our interpretation, a greater force and beauty from the sublime contrast which places the voluntary condescension and humiliation of Christ in the most striking light, as when he says: "Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head"; §§ or, "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many." ‖‖ Thus the

* Matth. 9, 27. 15, 22. 12, 23. 21, 9. 22, 41ff., etc.

† John 1, 51 (or v. 52 in the Greek text and the German version).

‡ John 3, 13. § Matth. 9, 6. Mark 2, 10. ‖ Matth. 12, 8. Mark 2, 28. ¶ John 6, 53.

** Matth 16, 17, comp. 19, 28. 24, 30. 25, 31. 26, 64. Luke 21, 27. 36.

†† Matth. 18, 11, comp. Luke 19, 10. ‡‡ John 5, 27. §§ Luke 9, 58.

‖‖ Matth. 20, 27. 28.

manhood of Christ, rising far above all ordinary manhood, though freely coming down to its lowest ranks with the view to their elevation and redemption, is already the portal of his godhood.

But he calls himself at the same time, as he is most frequently called by his disciples, "the Son of God" in an equally emphatic sense. He is not merely *a* Son of God among others, angels, archangels, princes and judges, and redeemed men, but *the* Son of God as no other being ever was, is, or can be, all others being sons or children of God only by derivation or adoption after a new spiritual birth, and in dependance on his absolute and eternal Sonship.* He is, as his favorite disciple calls him, the "Only begotten Son," or, as the old Catholic theology expresses it, eternally begotten of the substance of the Father. In this high sense the title is freely given to him by his disciples,† without a remonstrance on his part, and by God the Father himself at his baptism and at the transfiguration.‡ Christ represents himself moreover as being not of this world, but sent from God, as having come from God, and as being in heaven while living on earth.§ He not only announces and proclaims the truth as other messengers of God, but declares himself to be the Light of the World;‖ the Way, the Truth, and the Life;¶ the Resurrection and the Life.** "All things," he says, "are delivered unto me of my Father, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."†† He invites the weary

---

* Matth. 11, 27. 21, 37. 22, 42. 26, 63 f. 27, 43. Mark 12, 6. 13, 32. 14, 62. Luke 10, 22. John 5, 19—26. 9, 35—38. 10, 36. 11, 4. 14, 13. 17, 1. 19, 7.

† Matth. 16, 16. Mark 3, 11. John 1, 18. 34. 49. 11, 27. 20, 31,—besides the many passages in the Acts and Epistles, where the term *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* is as frequent as the term *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in the Gospels.

‡ Matth. 3, 17. Luke 3, 22. Matth. 17, 5. Luke 9, 35.

§ John 3, 13. ‖ John 8, 12. ¶ John 14, 6. ** John 11, 25.

†† Matth 11, 27. This passage is a striking parallel to the sublimest sayings in the fourth gospel, and proves the essential identity of the Synoptic and the Johannean picture of Christ.

and heavy laden to come to him for rest and peace.* He promises life in the highest and deepest sense, even eternal life to every one who believes in him.† He claims and admits to be the Christ or the Messiah of whom Moses and the prophets of old testify, and the King of Israel.‡ He is the Lawgiver of the new and last dispensation, § the Founder of a spiritual kingdom coextensive with the race, and everlasting as eternity itself, ‖ the appointed Judge of the quick and the dead,¶ the only Mediator between God and man, the Saviour of the world.** He parts from his disciples with those sublime words which alone certify his divinity: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." ††

Finally he claims such a relation to the Father, which implies both the equality of substance and the distinction of person, and which in connection with his declarations concerning the Holy Spirit leads with logical necessity, as it were, to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. For this doctrine saves the Divinity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit without affecting the fundamental truth of the Unity of the Godhead, and keeps the proper medium between an abstract and lifeless monotheism and a polytheistic tritheism.

He always distinguishes himself from God the Father, who sent him, whose work he came to fulfil, whose will he

---

* Matth. 11, 28. † John 3, 36. 5, 24. 6, 40. 47. 50—58. 11, 25.

‡ John 4, 26. 5, 39. 46. Matth. 14, 33. 16, 16 f. 26, 63 f., etc.

§ Matth. 5, 22—44. 28, 19. 20.

‖ Matth. 16, 19. 27, 11. Luke 22, 30. John 18, 36. Comp. Dan. 7, 13. Luke 1, 33.

¶ John 5, 22. 25—27. Matth. 25, 31 ff., etc.

** Matth. 18, 11. Luke 9, 56. 19, 10. John 3, 17. 5, 34. 10, 9. 12, 47.—Comp. Luke 1, 47. 2, 11. John 4, 42, etc.

†† Matth. 28, 18—20.

obeys, by whose power he performs his miracles, to whom he prays, and with whom he communes as a self-conscious personal being. And so he distinguishes himself with equal clearness from the Holy Spirit, whom he received at his baptism, whom he breathed into his disciples and whom he promised to send and did send on them as the other paraclet, as the Spirit of truth and holiness with the whole fulness of the accomplished salvation. But he never makes a similar distinction between himself and the Son of God; on the contrary he identifies himself with the Son of God, and uses this term, as already remarked, in a sense which implies much more than the Jewish conception of the Messiah and nothing short of the equality of essence or substance. For he claims as the Son a real self-conscious preexistence before man and even before the world, consequently also before time—for time was created with the world. "Before Abraham was," he says, "I am"—* significantly using the past in the one, and the present in the other case to mark the difference between man's temporal and his own eternal mode of existence—, and in the sacerdotal prayer he asks to be clothed again with the glory which he had with the Father before the foundation of the world.† He assumes divine names and attributes as far as consistent with his state of humiliation, he demands and receives divine honors.‡ He freely and repeatedly exercises the prerogative of pardoning sin in his own name, which the unbelieving Scribes and Pharisees with a logic whose force is irresistible on their premises, looked upon as blasphemous presumption.‖ He familiarly classes himself with the infinite majesty of Jehovah in one common plural, and boldly declares: "He that hath seen me hath seen the

---

* John 8, 58.

† John 17, 5. Comp. the testimony of the apostles on the preexistence, John 1, 1–14. Col. 1, 16. Heb. 1, 2. 3.

‡ John 5, 23.

‖ Matth. 9, 6. Luke 5, 20–24. 7, 47. 48. § John 14, 9.

Father;"§ "I and the Father are one."* He coordinates himself, in the baptismal formula, with the Divine Father, and the Divine Spirit,* and allows himself to be called by Thomas in the name of all the apostles: "My Lord and my God!"†

These are the most astounding and transcendant pretensions ever set up by any being. He, the humblest and lowliest of man, makes them repeatedly and uniformly to the last in the face of the whole world, even in the darkest hour of suffering. He makes them not in swelling, pompous, ostentatious language, which almost necessarily springs from false pretensions, but in a natural, spontaneous style, with perfect ease, freedom and composure, as a native prince would speak of the attributes and scenes of royalty at his father's court. He never falters or doubts, never apologizes for them, never enters into an explanation. He sets them forth as self-evident truths which need only be stated to challenge the belief and submission of mankind.

Now suppose for a moment a purely human teacher, however great and good, suppose a Moses or Elijah, a John the Baptist, an apostle Paul or John—not to speak of any father, schoolman, or reformer—to say: "I am the Light of the world," "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," "I and the Father are one," and call upon all men: "Come unto me," "Follow me," that you may find "life" and "peace" which you cannot find elsewhere: would it not create a universal feeling of pity or indignation? No human being on earth could set up the least of these pretensions without being set down at once as a madman or a blasphemer.

But from the mouth of Christ these colossal pretensions excite neither pity nor indignation, nor even the least feeling of

---

* John 10, 30. The passage teaches certainly more than the ethical unity of will, it asserts according to the context the unity of power which is based on the unity of essence or the homousia. The ἕν excludes Arianism, the plural ἐσμέν Sabellianism and Patripassianism.

† Matth. 28, 19.

‡ John 20, 28.

incongruity or impropriety. We read and hear them over and over again without surprise.* They seem perfectly natural and well sustained by a most extraordinary life and the most extraordinary works. There is no room here for the least suspicion of vanity, pride, or self-deception. For these eighteen hundred years these claims have been acknowledged by millions of people of all nations and tongues, of all classes and conditions, of the most learned and mighty as well as the most ignorant and humble with an instinctive sense of the perfect agreement of what Christ claimed to be with what he really was. Is not this fact most remarkable? Is it not a triumphant vindication of Christ's character and an irresistible proof of the truth of his pretensions?

There is no other solution of the mighty problem within the reach of human learning and ingenuity. Let us briefly review in conclusion the various attempts of Unitarians and unbelievers to account for the character of Christ without admitting his divinity.

The semi-infidelity of Socinians and Unitarians is singularly inconsistent. Admitting the faultless perfection of Christ's character and the truthfulness of the Gospel-history, and yet denying his divinity, they must either charge him with such egregious exaggerations and conceit as would overthrow at once the concession of his moral perfection, or they must so weaken and pervert his testimony concerning his relation to God as to violate all the laws of grammar and sound interpretation. Dr. W. E. Channing, the ablest and noblest reprepresentative of American Unitarianism, prefers to avoid the difficulty which he was unable to solve. In his admirable discourse on the Character of Christ he goes as far almost as any orthodox divine in vindicating to him the highest possible purity and excellency as a man,

* "Of all the readers of the Gospel," says Bushnell, p. 290, "it probably never even occurs to one in a hundred thousand, to blame his conceit, or the egregious vanity of his pretensions." Even the better class of Unitarians instinctively bow before these claims. See the remarkable passage of Dr. Channing quoted below.

but he stops half way and passes by in silence those extraordinary claims, which are inexplicable on merely human principles. He approaches, however, the very threshold of the true faith in the following remarkable passage which we have a right to quote against his own system. "I confess," he says, "when I can escape the deadening power of habit, and can receive the full import of such passages as the following,—'Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,'—'I am come to seek and to save that which was lost,'—'He that confesseth me before men, him will I confess before my Father in heaven,'—'Whosoever shall be ashamed of me before men, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of the Father with the holy angels,'—'In my Father's house are many mansions; I go to prepare a place for you:'—I say, when I can succeed in realizing the import of such passages, I feel myself listening to a being, such as never before and never since spoke in human language. I am awed by the consciousness of greatness which these simple words express; and when I connect this greatness with the proofs of Christ's miracles which I gave you in a former discourse, I am compelled to exclaim with the centurion, 'Truly, this was the Son of God.'" But this is not all. We have seen that Christ goes much further than in the passages here quoted, that he forgives sins in his own name, that he asserts pre-existence before Abraham and before the world —not only ideally in the mind of God, for this would not distinguish him from Abraham or any other creature, but in the real sense of self-conscious personal existence—, that he claims and receives divine honors and attributes, and calls himself equal with the great Jehovah. How can a being so pure and holy, and withal so humble and lowly, so perfectly free from every trace of enthusiasm and conceit, as Dr. Channing freely and emphatically asserts Christ to have been, lay claim to any thing which he was not in fact.* Why then not also go beyond the exclamation of the heathen centurion, and unite with the con-

* Discourse on the *Character of Christ*, in Channing's Works, vol. IV. p. 20.

fession of Peter and the adoration of the skeptical St. Thomas: "My Lord and my God!" Unitarianism admits altogether too much for its own conclusions and is therefore driven to the logical alternative of falling back upon an infidel, or of advancing to the orthodox christology. Such a man as Channing, who was certainly under the influence of the holy example of Christ, would not hesitate for the choice, as we may infer from his general spirit and from his last address delivered at Lenox, Massachusetts in 1842, shortly before his death, where he said: "The doctrine of the Word made flesh shows us God uniting himself intimately with our nature, manifesting himself in a human form, for the very end of making us partakers of his own perfection."

The infidelity of the enemies of Christianity is logically more consistent, though absolutely untenable in the premises. It resorts either to imposture, or enthusiasm, or poetical fiction.

The hypothesis of *imposture* is so revolting to moral as well as common sense that its mere statement is its condemnation. It has never been seriously carried out, and no scholar of any decency and self-respect would now dare to profess it.† How, in the name of logic and experience, could an imposter, that is a deceitful, selfish, depraved man, have invented and consistently maintained from beginning to end the purest and noblest character known in history,

† It was first suggested by the heathen assailants of Christianity, Celsus and Julian the Apostate, then insinuated by French deists of the Voltairean school, but never raised to the dignity of scientific argument. The only attempt to carry it out, and that a mere fragmentary one, was made by the anonymous "*Wolfenbuettel Fragmentist*," since known as Hermann Samuel Reimarus, professor of oriental literature in the College at Hamburg, who died in 1786. His *Fragments* were never intended for publication, but only for a few friends. Lessing found them in the library at Wolfenbüttel and commenced to publish them, without the author's knowledge, in 1774, not, as he said, because he agreed with them, but because he wished to arouse the spirit of investigation. This mode of procedure Semler, the father of German neology, wittingly compared to the act of setting a city on fire for the purpose of trying the engines.

with the most perfect air of truth and reality? How could he have conceived and succefsfully carried through, in the face of the strongest prejudices of his people and age, a plan of unparalleled beneficence, moral magnitude and sublimity, and sacrified his own life for it? The difficulty is not lessened by shifting the charge of fraud from Christ upon the apostles and evangelists, who were any thing but designing hypocrites and deceivers, and leave upon every unsophisticated reader the impression of an artless simplicity and honesty rarely equalled and never surpassed by any writers learned or unlearned, of ancient or modern times. What imaginable motive could have induced them to engage in such a wicked scheme, when they knew that the whole world would persecute them even to death? How could they have formed and successfully sustained a conspiracy for such a purpose without ever falling out or betraying themselves by some inconsistent word or act? And who can believe that the Christian Church for these eighteen hundred years, now embracing nearly the whole civilized world, should have been duped and fooled by a Galilean carpenter or a dozen illiterate fishermen? Verily this lowest form of infidelity is the grossest insult to reason and sense and to the dignity of human nature.

The hypothesis of *enthusiasm* or self-deception, though less disreputable, is equally unreasonable in view of the uniform clearness, calmness, self-possession, humility, dignity and patience of Christ,—qualities the very opposite to those which characterize an enthusiast. We might imagine a Jew of that age to have fancied himself the Messiah and the Son of God, but instead of opposing all the popular notions, and discouraging all the temporal hopes of his countrymen, he would, like Barcochba of a later period, have headed a rebellion against the hated tyranny of the Romans and endeavored to establish a temporal kingdom. Enthusiasm, which in this case must have bordered on madness itself, instead of calmly and patiently bearing the malignant opposition of the leaders of the nation, would have broken out in violent passion and precipitate action.

"The charge," says Dr. Channing, "of an extravagant, self-deluding enthusiasm is the last to be fastened on Jesus. Where can we find the traces of it in his history? Do we detect them in the calm authority of his precepts; in the mild, practical, and beneficent spirit of his religion; in the unlabored simplicity of the language with which he unfolds his high powers, and the sublime truths of religion; or in the good sense, the knowledge of human nature, which he always discovers in his estimate and treatment of the different classes of men with whom he acted? Do we discover this enthusiasm in the singular fact, that whilst he claimed power in the future world, and always turned men's minds to Heaven, he never indulged his own imagination, or stimulated that of his disciples, by giving vivid pictures, or any minute description, of that unseen state? The truth is, that, remarkable as was the character of Jesus, it was distinguished by something more than by calmness and self-possession. This trait pervades his other excellences. How calm was his piety! Point me, if you can, to one vehement, passionate expression of his religious feelings. Does the Lord's Prayer breath a feverish enthusiasm? . . . His benevolence, too, though singularly earnest and deep, was composed and serene. He never lost the possession of himself in his sympathy with others; was never hurried into the impatient and rash enterprises of an enthusiastic philanthrophy; but did good with the tranquility and constancy which mark the providence of God."*

But the champions of this theory may admit all this, and yet fasten the delusion upon the disciples of Christ who were so dazzled by his character, words and works that they mistook an extraordinary man for a divine being, and extraordinary cures for supernatural miracles. This is the view of the older German rationalism (the so called *rationalismus communis, or vulgaris*†), and forms a parallel

---

* Discourse on the Character of Christ. Works, vol. IV. 17 and 18.

† Or the rationalism of common sense, as distinct from the rationalism of

to the heathen rationalism of Euhemerus, of the Cyrenaic school, who explained the gods of the Greek mythology as human sages, heroes, kings and tyrants, whose superior knowledge or great deeds secured them divine honors or the hero-worship of posterity.‡ It was fully developed, with a considerable degree of patient learning and acumen, by the late professor H. E. G. Paulus of Heidelberg.‖ He takes the gospel history as actual history, but by a critical separation of what he calls *fact* from what he calls *judgement* of the actor or narrator, he explains it exclusively from natural causes and thus brings it down to the level of every day events. This "natural" interpretation, however, turns out to be most unnatural and commits innumerable sins against the laws of hermeneutics and against common sense itself. To prove this it is only necessary to give some specimens from the exegesis of Paulus and his school. The glory of the Lord which, in the night of his birth, shone around the shepherds of Jerusalem, was simply an *ignis fatuus*, or a meteor; the miracle at Christ's baptism may be easily reduced to thunder and lightening and a sudden disappearance of the clouds; the tempter in the wilderness was a cunning Pharisee, and was only mistaken by the evangelists for the devil who does not exist except in the imagination of the superstitious; the supposed miraculous cures of the Saviour turn out on closer examination to be simply deeds either of philanthrophy, or medical skill, or good luck: the changing of

uncommon sense or speculative reason. The sense of both systems, however, ends is non-sense. Dr. Marheineke defined a Rationalist or, as Paulus called him, a *Denkglaeubige*, as a man, *der zu denken glaubt und zu glauben denkt; es ist aber mit beidem gleich null.* The Hegelian school has successfully rediculed common rationalism and made every scholar of philosophical pretensions ashamed of it. But the infidel wing of that school has at last relapsed into the same or still greater absurdities.

‡ Comp. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibli. Fragm.* l. vii; Cicero, *De natura deor.* l. 42; Sextus Empir., *Adv. math.* ix. 17.

‖ Born in the kingdom of Würtemberg 1761, then successively professor in different universities, at last in Heidelberg, where he died in 1847, after having long outlived himself. His rationalistic exegesis is laid down in his *Commentary on the Gospels*, published since 1800, and his *Life of Jesus*, 1828.

water into wine was an innocent and benevolent wedding joke, and the delusion of the company must be charged on the twilight, not upon Christ; the daughter of Jairus, the youth of Nain, Lazarus, and Jesus himself, were raised not from real death, but simply from a trance or swoon; and the ascension of the Lord is nothing more than his sudden disappearance behind a cloud that accidentally intervened between him and his disciples! And yet these very evangelists, who must have been destitute of the most ordinary talent of observation and even of common sense, have contrived to paint a character and to write a story which in sublimity, grandeur and interest throws the productions of the proudest historians into the shade, and has exerted an irresistible charm upon Christendom for these eighteen hundred years! No wonder that those absurdities of a misguided learning and ingenuity hardly survived their author. It is a decided merit of Strauss that he has thoroughly refuted the work of his predecessor, and given it the death blow. But his own theory has shared no better fate.

The last hypothesis of a *poetical fiction* was matured and carried out with a high degree of ability and ingenuity by the speculative or pantheistic rationalism of David Frederick Strauss, the author of the famous *Life of Jesus.** This writer sinks the Gospel-history, as to the mode of its orgin and realness, substantially on a par with the ancient mythologies of Greece and Rome. Without denying altogether the historical existence of Jesus, and even admitting him to have been a religious genius of the first magnitude, he yet, from pantheistic premises and by a cold process of hypercritical dissection of the apparently contradictory accounts of the witnesses, resolves all the supernatural and miraculous elements of his person and history into myths, or imaginative representations of religious ideas in the form of facts which

* The *Leben Jesu* by Strauss, Dr. phil., who was born in 1806 and is still living, was first published 1835 at Tübingen in 2 volumes, and for the fourth, in all probability also for the last time in 1840. It was also translated into English by a Miss Evans.

were honestly believed by the authors to have actually occurred. The ideas symbolized in these facts are declared to be true in the abstract or as applied to humanity as a whole, but denied as false in the concrete or in their application to an individual. The authorship of the evangelical myths is ascribed to the primitive Christian society pregnant with Jewish Messianic hopes and kindled to hero worship by the appearance of the extraordinary person of Jesus of Nazareth whom they took to be the promised Messiah. But this theory is likewise surrounded by insurmountable difficulties. Who ever heard of a poem unconsciously produced by a mixed multitude and honestly mistaken by them all for actual history? How could the five hundred persons, to whom the risen Saviour is said to have appeared, dream the same dream at the same time, and then believe it as a veritable fact at the risk of their lives? How could a man like St. Paul submit his strong and clear mind and devote all the energies of his noble life to a poetical fiction of the very sect whom he once persecuted unto death? How could such an illusion stand the combined hostility of the Jewish and heathen world, and the searching criticism of an age of high civilization, and even of incredulity and skepticism? How strange that unlettered and unskilled fishermen, and not the philosophers and poets of classic Greece and Rome, should have composed such a grand poem and painted a character to whom Strauss himself is forced to assign the very first rank among all the religious geniuses and founders of religion!

The poets must in this case have been superior to the hero, and yet the hero is admitted to be the purest and greatest man that ever lived! Where are the traces of a fervid imagination and poetic art in the Gospel history? Is it not, on the contrary, remarkably free from all rhetorical and poetical ornament, from every admixture of subjective notions and feelings, even from the expression of sympathy, admiration and praise? The writers evidently felt that the story speaks best for itself and could not be improved by the art and skill of man. Their discrepancies,

which at best do not affect the picture of Christ's character in the least but only the subordinate details of his history, prove the absence of conspiracy, attest the honesty of their intention and confirm the general credibility of their account. Verily, the Gospel history, related with such unmistakable honesty and simplicity by immediate witnesses and their pupils, proclaimed in open day light from Jerusalem to Rome, believed by thousands of Jews, Greeks and Romans, sealed with the blood of apostles, evangelists and saints of every grade of society and culture, is better attested by external and internal evidence than any other history. The same negative criticism, which Strauss applied to the Gospels, would with equal plausibility destroy the strongest chain of evidence before a court of justice, and resolve the life of Socrates, or Charlemagne, or Luther, or, Napoleon into a mythical dream. The secret of the mythical hypothesis is the pantheistic denial of a personal living God and the a priori assumption of the impossibility of a miracle. In its details it is so complicated and artificial that it can not be made generally intelligible, and in proportion as it is popularized, it reverts to the vulgar hypothesis of intentional fraud from which it professed at the start to shrink back in horror and contempt.

With this last and ablest effort, infidelity seems to have exhausted its scientific resources. It could only repeat itself hereafter. Its different theories have all been tried and found wanting. One has in turn transplanted and refuted the other, even during the lifetime of their champions. They explain nothing in the end; on the contrary, they only substitute an unnatural for a supernatural miracle, an inextricable enigma for a revealed mystery. They equally tend to undermine all faith in God's Providence, in history, and ultimately in every principle of truth and virtue, and they deprive a poor and fallen humanity, in a world of sin, temptation and sorrow, of its only hope and comfort in life and in death.

Dr. Strauss, by far the clearest and strongest of all assailants of the Gospel-history, seems to have had a passing

feeling of the disastrous tendency of his work of destruction and the awful responsibility he assumed. "The results of our inquiry," he says in the closing chapter of his *Life of Jesus*, "have apparently annihilated the greatest and most important part of that which the Christian has been wont to believe concerning his Jesus, have uprooted all the encouragements which he has derived from his faith, and deprived him of all his consolations. The boundless store of truth and life which for eighteen hundred years have been the aliment of humanity, seems irretrievably devastated, the most sublime levelled with the dust, God divested of his grace, man of his dignity, and the tie between heaven and earth broken. Piety turns away with horror from so fearful an act of desecration, and strong in the impregnable self-evidence of its faith, boldly pronounces that—let an audacious criticism attempt what it will—all which the Scriptures declare and the Church believes of Christ, will still subsist as eternal truth, nor needs one iota of it to be renounced."* Strauss makes then an attempt, it is true, at a philosophical reconstruction of what he vainly imagines to have annihilated as a historical fact by his sophistical criticism. He professes to admit the abstract truth of the orthodox christology, or the union of the divine and human, but perverts it into a purely intellectual and pantheistic meaning. He refuses divine attributes and honors to the glorious head of the race, but applies them to a decapitated humanity. He thus substitutes, from pantheistic prejudice, a metaphysical abstraction for a living reality, a mere notion for a historical fact, a progress in philosophy and mechanical arts for the moral victory over sin and death, a pantheistic hero worship, or self-adoration of a fallen race, for the worship of the only true and living God, the gift of a stone for the bread of eternal life!†

---

* *Leben Jesu*, Schlussabhandlung, vol. ii., p. 663 (4th ed. of 1840).

† "In an individual," says Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. p. 710, "in one Godman the properties and functions which the church doctrine ascribes to Christ, contradict themselves; in the idea of the race they agree. *Humanity*

Humanity scorns such a miserable substitute, which has yet to give the first proof of any power for good, and which will probably never convert or improve a single individual. It must have a living head, a real Lord and Saviour from sin and death. With renewed faith and confidence it returns from the dreary desolations of a heartless infidelity and the vain conceits of a philosophy falsely so called, to the historical Christ, and exclaims with Peter: "Lord, where shall we go but to Thee, Thou alone hast words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that Thou art the Son of God!"

Yes! There He lives, the Divine man and incarnate God, on the ever fresh and self-authenticating record of the Gospels, in the unbroken history of eighteen centuries, and in the hearts and lives of the wisest and best of our race. Jesus Christ is the most certain, the most sacred, and the most glorious of all facts, arrayed in a beauty and majesty which throws the "starry heavens above us and the moral law within us" into obscurity, and fills us

---

is the union of the two natures—the incarnate God, the infinite externalizing itself in the finite, and the finite spirit remembering its infinitude; it is the child of the visible mother and the invisible father, Nature and Spirit; it is the worker of miracles, in so far as in the course of human history the spirit more and more completely subjugates nature, both within and around man, until it lies before him as an inert matter of his activity; it is the sinless existence, for the course of its development is a blameless one; pollution cleaves to the individual only, and does not touch the race or its history. It is Humanity that dies, rises, and ascends to heaven; for from the negation of its natural life there ever proceeds a higher spiritual life; from the suppression of its limitation as a personal, national, and terrestial spirit, arises its union with the infinite spirit of the heavens. By faith in this Christ, especially in his death and resurrection, man is justified before God: that is, by the kindling within him of the idea of Humanity, especially by the negation of its natural and sensual aspects, the individual man partakes of the divinely human life of the species."—But the idea of the human and divine is no more contradictory in an individual than in the race. What is true in idea or principle, must also actualize itself or be capable of actualization in a concrete living fact. History teaches moreover that every age, every great movement, and every nation have their representative heads, who comprehend and act out the life of the respective whole. This analogy points us to a general representative head of the entire race, Adam in the natural, and Christ in the spiritual order. The divine humanity of Strauss is like a stream without a fountain, or like a body without a head.

truly with ever growing reverence and awe. He shines forth with the self-evidencing light of the noon-day sun. He is too great, too pure, too perfect to have been invented by any sinful and erring man. His character and claims are confirmed by the sublimest doctrine, the purest ethics, the mightiest miracles, the grandest spiritual kingdom, and are daily and hourly exhibited in the virtues and graces of all who yield to the regenerating and sanctifying power of his spirit and example. The historical Christ meets and satisfies our deepest intellectual and moral wants. Our souls, if left to their noblest impulses and aspirations, instinctively turn to him as the needle to the magnet, as the flower to the sun, as the panting hart to the fresh fountain. We are made for him, and "our heart is without rest until it rests in him." He commands our assent, he wins our admiration, he overwhelms us to humble adoration and worship. We cannot look upon him without spiritual benefit. We cannot think of him without being elevated above all that is low and mean, and encouraged to all that is good and noble. The very hem of his garment is healing to the touch; one hour spent in his communion outweighs all the pleasures of sin. He is the most precious and indispensable gift of a merciful God to a fallen world. In him are the treasures of true wisdom, in him the fountain of pardon and peace, in him the only substantial hope and comfort in this world and that which is to come. Without him history is a dreary waste, an inextricable enigma; with him it is the unfolding of a plan of infinite wisdom and love. He is the glory of the past, the life of the present, the hope of the future. Mankind could better afford to lose the whole literature of Greece and Rome, of Germany and France, of England and America, than the story of Jesus of Nazareth. Not for all the wealth and wisdom of this world would I weaken the faith of the humblest Christian in his Divine Lord and Saviour; but if, by the grace of God, I could convert a single skeptic to a childlike faith in him, who lived and died for me and for all, I would feel that I had not lived in vain.

P. S.

ART. II.—THE DIVINING ROD.*

Mankind must believe in the mysterious. From the earliest childhood, when the reasoning powers are but budding forth, to that period of life when the full enjoyment of these same powers gives him a wide command over the forces and products of nature, he has always a secret love of the mysterious—the hidden. Faith, either in the holy mysteries of a pure religion, or in the foul and obscene secrets of that which is false, will be found more or less present in his soul. And outside of *religious* faith, there will be a belief in the existence of beings gifted with supernatural powers who are either benefactors or tormentors of the human race: bright little fairies singing,

> "Over hill, over dale,
> Thorough bush, thorough briar,
> Over park, over pale,
> Thorough flood, thorough fire,
> I do wander every where,
> Swifter than the moones sphere
> And I serve the fairy queen,
> To dew her orbs upon the green,"

or shrewd and knavish sprites like him "called Robin Good-fellow:"

> "That fright the maidens of the villagery;
> Skim milk; and sometimes labour in the quern,
> And bootless make the breathless housewife churn;
> And sometime make the drink to bear no barm;
> Mislead night-wanderers, laughing at their harm;"

rewarders of good children, like the St. Nicholas of Christmas eve who comes with his cornucopia of happiness for the little ones, bestowing brightness and joy on their expectant countenances, or punishers of the bad, like the Pelznickel

* Histoire du Merveilleux dans les Temps modernes par Louis Figuier. Tome Deuxieme. La Baguette Divinatoire. Paris, 1860.

of that same eve who carries a rod and all kinds of unpleasant instruments of punishment for those who have neglected duties, been unmindful of the claims of parental authority, and have not been "good children."

Connected, naturally, with such a belief, is the idea that the hidden forces of nature may be placed at the command of man, through some supernatural power, or through some means not explained by ordinary philosophical laws. This idea may develop itself in the form of magic incantations supposed to possess wonderful powers over the spirits of the earth and air, peculiar rites or processes which invest those performing them with special privileges not allowed to their brethren, or in the recognition of peculiar influences belonging to certain signs and symbols. Popular superstitions, as to lucky or unlucky days, also owe their origin to this love of the mysterious. These ideas and popular notions cannot, as a general thing, be traced back to their true ground. They have grown, from small beginnings, until their present form has been reached, partly through a natural development of the primitive idea, and partly through additions made from without. Some of them, however, are of such a character that we can trace them back to the starting point and study them through all the phases of their development. To this class belongs *the divining rod*, to which we propose to direct our attention at present. Although this has been employed by the impostor and knave, with the view of deceiving the credulous and unsuspecting, yet it is also found occasionally in the hands of the latter class themselves, and at times producing results which demand attention from men of science. It will not then be uninteresting or profitless, if we attempt to give an account of the origin and use of the divining rod in ancient times, its employment in the middle ages, and the attempted explanations of the phenomena attributed to its use in the hands of men asserted to be specially skillful.

The rod has been the symbol and type of authority from the earliest antiquity. Holy Writ and ancient mythology

furnish abundant proofs of this statement. The Psalms show that it was also employed, at times, as a symbol of protection,—Thy *rod* and thy staff they comfort me. However employed typically, it implied some supernatural power. A few examples will be allowed us by way of illustration—Christ is called "the rod of thy strength;" His power is called a *rod* of iron—"Thou shalt break them with a *rod* of iron,"—"He shall rule them with a *rod* of iron;" Job speaks of the wrath of God as a rod—"Let him take away his *rod* from me,"—"neither is the *rod* of God upon them;" Isaiah uses it as a means of showing the miraculous birth of the Saviour—"And there shall come forth a *rod* out of the stem of Jesse." It was employed as a means of producing miracles,—passing thus from a type into the means, which the Almighty used for the purpose of impressing certain truths on the hearts and minds of the favorite people. The latter, however, becoming unmindful of the fact that the power was not innate in the rod, soon began to use it in divination. Hosea says, "My people ask counsel at their stocks, and their staff declareth unto them;"—and the reference to divination in Ezekiel may justify the supposition that the rod was also referred to by that prophet—"For the king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use *divination;* he made his arrows bright, he consulted with images, he looked in the liver."

With the Romans the *caduceus* was the symbol of peace, as the spear was that of war. It was usually a rod with a representation of two snakes wound around it, the origin of which mythology asserts to have been the separation of two snakes, while fighting, by the rod of Mercury. The augurs, when dividing the heavens, in their divinations, always employed a crooked staff called *lituus*, described as incurvum et leviter a summo inflexum bacileum. This was first used by Romulus in the location of the imperial city,—and being found in the temple, after the destruction of Rome, it became a hallowed object in the eyes of the people. Livy speaks of its employment in the consecra-

tion of Numa Pompilius as the second king of Rome, who refused to accept the regal position until a consultation of the gods, through augury, should reveal their pleasure. The augur ascended a high mountain, "there having taken in his right hand a curved rod" and examined the different regions of the heavens, he besought Jupiter to make some signs which would indicate his approval of Numa as king, when the rod was placed on his head.

And from the ancient Hebrews, the Romans and Greeks, the use of the rod passed to other nations until, according to Taylor,* "a belief in the existence of divination, or the art of foretelling events, however variously manifested, appears to be, except among Christians, coextensive with a belief in the Divinity, from which it derives its name. On this account, the stoics considered the two propositions inseparable. *Sunt dî; ergo est Divinatio.*" Of course we do not claim that divination was always performed by means of the rod, but it was one of the most common methods, employed by those who wished to foretell events or to discover the hidden treasures of nature.

In modern times the use of the rod appears to have been reintroduced by the Germans, although the French for many years were very much excited on the subject and seem to have been carried away by an insane frenzy to experiment with the rod, not only for the purpose of discovering the treasures of the earth, but also streams of pure water, and even the traces of murderers and other gross violators of Divine and human laws. We avail ourselves freely in this article of the materials, which Dr. Figuier has brought together on this subject, believing that we are presenting for the first time, in English, much that is interesting as well as intensely curious.

The divining rod was employed by the Baroness de Beausoleil in revealing the metallic treasures of France. This noble lady devoted herself, in conjunction with her husband, to the study of metallurgy and mineralogy, expending in

* Occult Sciences, 291.

this study an enormous private fortune. With the view, however, of making the results of her investigations the more wonderful, she pretended that she employed divining rods of seven different kinds, which gave indications always of metals when concealed under the soil. The result of this was the arrest of herself and husband under the charge of sorcery, and their death in prison. She had announced the discovery of subterranean mineral waters, made simply by holding one of the rods in her hand when it would be attracted powerfully towards the ground, over the places where these were concealed. But errors must always grow. After her death *Royer* announced that the divining rod was adapted for the detection of all kinds of concealed articles,—and he claimed, that it was a matter of indifference as to the material out of which the rod was made. It might be of wood, gold, silver, ivory, the horns of beef or any other animal, even of a cabbage stalk. It would detect every thing, except such as were connected with the immaterial or spiritual world. This was a total change of qualities in the instrument. At first it was entirely used on account of its prophetic power as regards events, and "the moral attribute was the only quality of the divining rod." A few centuries have passed away, and its friends claim for it every thing *but* this moral attribute. Tempora mutantur, nos et mutamur in illis. Every fashion has its day, and when it disappears the disappearance is not final, but only for a little while. It will again show itself above the horizon, gradually advance until it reaches the zenith and then speedily sink into obscurity. This is true, not only of fashion as regards clothing and the manners of society, but also of superstitions and popular delusions. Towards the end of the seventeenth century, the rod is once more employed on account of its moral properties. The most remarkable pretender of this period was Jacques Aymar, whose history, in connection with the divining rod, is of sufficient interest to claim more than a passing notice.

Jacques Aymar's skill was called into requisition by the

authorities, who were endeavoring to ascertain the perpetrators of a double murder in the city of Lyons. The bodies of a wine merchant and his wife were found in the cellar of their shop, a bottle wrapped with straw and a bloody billhook by their sides. Appearances justified the idea, that a robbery of the shop had been committed by the party or parties, who had committed the murder. The officers of justice, being absolutely at fault as to any mode of tracing the criminals, were induced to ask the aid of Jacques Aymar, a native of the village of Dauphiny. These were the days, when torture was employed as a legal means of obtaining information in criminal cases, and there will hence be no cause of wonder that the divining rod was employed by legal authority. The operator offered to undertake the investigation provided he was first brought to the place where the murder was committed, so that he might take the impression (*prendre son impression*). Guided by the prosecuting attorney, he visited the wine merchant's cellar, having placed between his hands a rod of the first kind of wood that he could find. "The rod remained immovable until the moment when he passed over the spot, where the corpse of the wine merchant had been found. Then it became violently agitated; he himself very much affected and his pulse was accelerated as though he were in a fever. This excitement increased, when he came to the spot where the corpse of the second victim had been found. Having thus received *his impression*, Aymar left the cellar, and, guided by his rod, or rather by the inner feeling which made it move, he ascended into the shop through which the assassins had taken flight. Leaving the shop, he followed, street after street, the tracks of the murderers; entered the court of the archbishop, crossed it, and only stopped at the gate by the Rhone, which was closed, because this fantastic perquisition was executed at night." He commences his operations, the next morning. Leaving Lyons by the bridge over the Rhone, he descends the right bank of the river. His rod at times informs him there were three, and again only two, associated in the

atrocious crime. He enters a gardener's house, and there declares that there were three assassins, and that they had been in that house. Accompanied by proper officers, he descended the Rhone, and, after many marvellous revelations by the rod, detects one of the assassins in a prison at Beaucaire. This man admitted that he was present when the murder was committed, but denied that he had been engaged in it. The prisoner was brought to Lyons, to the great satisfaction of the magistrates, and the enthusiastic admiration of the people. A new escort was furnished Aymar and he was again started off on his curious investigation. At Toulon, however, he was obliged to give it up. The man arrested was duly condemned to be broken alive on the wheel, and the sentence was carried out August 30, 1692.

This whole account seems to belong to some dark period of history, or to some nation not yet visited by the light of civilization. But unless the most indubitable evidence were furnished us, that it had occurred at the time mentioned, human credulity would not admit it a possible occurrence so near our era. "The virtue of the divining rod, so long considered a mere popular superstition, had been recognized as a juridical verity." Figuier thus deprives the whole affair of all supernatural character: "Aymar had evidently obtained some important data as to the murder. * * It is possible that he may have learned from his friend, who lived near the victims, that a hunchback had been seen among the men prowling around the house on the day of the crime." This was a hint which he followed up until the result was attained of seizing a hunchback in a prison, who made the confession. "What is extraordinary is the confession made by the prisoner, a confession which his extreme youth and his strong belief in the power of the rod may explain. It is probable, however, that without this confession, the judges would have hesitated to pronounce sentence of death, and that this affair would not have had the reputation it received and would not have conferred so great honor on the infallibility of the divining

rod." It was one of those occurrences, where accident, or rather Providence, had lead the hands of justice, by means altogether in themselves inadequate, to the detection of the perpetrator of a gross crime.

Attention having been turned towards the divining rod by the affair at Lyons, physicians began to experiment and physicists to denounce while the people, ever ready to grasp at the mysterious, gave their hearty credence to the asserted powers of the rod. Some experiments, made in the presence of and by Pauthot—Dean of the College of Medicine at Lyons,—furnished results that exhibited the extraordinary effects of the use of the rod in their true light. Whenever Aymar passed over the place, where the dead bodies had been found, he was seized with violent convulsions, and the rod was so forcibly bent towards the ground that it appeared ready to break. When the same rod was placed in the hands of another person, *not* a physician and *not* accustomed to cool examination of phenomena, effects very similar, to those shown in Aymar's person, made their appearance. But when Pauthot took the rod in his hands, all these effects were not apparent. It remained *immovable* although he passed frequently over the place where the bodies had been found, and no agitation was experienced in his system. We begin to see how the imagination or "the involuntary connivance of the spirit might act in the production of such phenomena."

In the year 1698 the fame of Jacques Aymar, who was actively employed in the interim in bemystifying his neighbors and living on the reputation obtained from the case we have related, was summoned to Paris by the Prince of Condé to exhibit some of his marvellous powers in his presence. Apartments were assigned him with the Concierge of the hotel, in order that he might be under the eye of the Prince himself. But here began Aymar's downfall. He was taken one day to the garden. Five holes had previously been made and in them gold and silver, copper and stones were respectively placed. The diviner, with his rod, pretended not only that he could detect

metals, but that he could distinguish them from one another. "When he was put to the test, he failed to detect anything, once declaring the existence of precious metals in the hole containing stones and at another time in one that was absolutely empty."

Test after test was now applied by the Prince of Condé. No results were obtained of the character promised by Aymar, and the Prince, being satisfied of the true character of the ignorant pretender, informed the public that Aymar's rod "was nothing but a pure illusion and a chimerical invention." There was no longer any chance for the employment of the divining rod in Paris, and Aymar retired to Lyons where a willing people still received his revelations as truths, and fabricated all kinds of excuses for his mistakes.

He next makes his appearance, on the page of history, in the capacity of detector of Protestants, in the war waged against them by the Marshal Montrevel. The rod was employed to indicate such persons as had attended protestant meetings. Being directed towards an individual suspected, if the suspicion was founded on fact it would immediately turn, and such an individual was consigned to the gibbet or the wheel. How many lives were sacrificed in this way through the rage of sectarian zeal, aided by an ignorant pretender, we are not able to state. The mind grows weary of dwelling upon such scenes, and history gives us nothing more of Aymar. He proved to be as useful to the murderous bigotry of his co-religionists, as he had been to the wonder-lovers and prodigy-seekers in the city of Lyons.

The fame acquired by Aymar in Dauphiny proved to be very attractive to the good people of that province. Many followers were raised up, who rivalled Aymar in their pretensions and were doubtless as reliable in their divinations. The rod was the judge of all questions under examination. "It revealed metals and springs, robbers and unreliable debtors;" furnished indications concerning concealed relics of the saints or property purloined from sinners, determined the value of horses exposed to sale and the true owner-

ship of lands; indeed its applications were as numerous as the wants of mankind. Every native of Dauphiny employed it, "men and women, children and old people, clergy and laity, all practised divination with the rod, despite pastoral mandates and instructions." All the marvellous effects were attributed to satanic agency. When this belief once took hold of the people, it proved particularly distressing to those who had been distinguished for their skill in the use of the rod, and they devoted themselves to prayers to the Almighty to withdraw the diabolical gift, and these always had the effect of freeing them immediately. The true connection between the will or the intention of the operator and the movement of the rod is clearly shown in the fact, that whenever a great desire was experienced to get rid of the power of moving the rod, it was always followed by a loss of this power.

Prominent among the employers of the divining rod, after Aymar, was Barthélemy Bleton who employed it as a hydroscope, or a means of detecting wells or springs of water. His mode of operating was by holding the rod between the first fingers of his two hands; when he passed over a subterranean collection of water, he was seized with a febrile agitation, and there was a downward movement of the rod. Dr. Thouvenel made a series of experiments with Bleton about the year 1780. It was pretended that he could detect subterranean springs, even when his eyes were bandaged and his arms held by one or more persons. Thouvenel, believing the revelations of Bleton, attempted their explanation by an electrical theory, which explains nothing at all. Bleton was invited to Paris in 1782. Lalande, the great astronomer, showed that the movements of the rod were the result of practice, which enabled Bleton to move the rod without showing any movement of his body. The accounts of his experiments are very contradictory. The journals were divided on this subject into *Bletonians* and *Anti-bletonians*, and partizan feeling ran so high that one finds it difficult to select that which is reliable from their statements. His friends asserted that he

could always find water, although he *might* mistake its depth and volume. This was an excellent subterfuge, as it enabled the *hydroscopist* to say, in case water was not found, on digging to a moderate depth, that it would be found if the well was only made deeper. His friends, and the credulous Thouvenel, alleged that he had made no mistake in eight hundred experiments. Yet a number of chemists report, that he had passed frequently through an alley, under which a pipe, two inches in width, containing water was laid, without any alteration in the direction of the rod, while he declared that canals and springs were concealed under the church of St. Geneviève. The latter blunder was readily explained by the statement that a current of moist air had produced the same effect as a current of subterranean water. But explanations and excuses are never very difficult to an ingenious, crafty man.

In 1790, Thouvenel having emigrated to Italy, found another Dauphinese, Pennet, who pretended to the same hydroscopic powers as Bleton. Spallanzani, the great physiologist, had been astonished at first by Pennet's apparent powers, but more deliberate examinations satisfied him that they were but apparent and not real. The savans of Italy were however very much divided in their opinions on the subject of the powers of the divining rod. Some attempted to explain, what they believed to be facts, by the supposed action of electric currents. This was at the time when the discoveries of Galvani and Volta, on the subject of the physiological effects of electricity, had attracted the attention of students of medical and physical science. But the use of the word electricity was then, as too frequently now, merely the resort of ignorance. Whenever a phenomenon was dark or mysterious, it was referred to the agency of electricity, without the slightest effort being made to show how there could be the relation of cause and effect between it and the phenomenon. Ignorance or limited knowledge always thus jumps to conclusions, without employing any intermediate reasoning. The appearance of a comet in the heavens is to him, who is innocent of any

knowledge of astronomy, the direct or remote cause of all present disasters, failure of crops, destructive wars, epidemic diseases among men and beasts, commercial troubles, and all possible evils that may afflict humanity. There is nothing on which our reasoning is so very loose and faulty, as on the relation of cause to effect. A sequence is accepted as a consequence, and a high-sounding term at once becomes sufficient, to explain any marvellous occurrence, to those whose minds have not been carefully trained in a strict school of logic.

The result of the general excitement in Italy, on the subject of the divining rod as a hydroscope, was precisely the same as in France and Germany. "Savants could not agree as to the value of experiments, even when they were most successful. There were enthusiastic affirmations and obstinate negations, sudden conversions and audacious denials,—and afterwards a dense melée of written statements, reports, journal articles, panegyrics and diatribes."

In England and America no general interest has ever been excited on this subject, although some very singular results have been apparently obtained by a few individuals, whose honesty and integrity could not for a moment be suspected. In this investigation, as in investigations of all mysterious and inexplicable phenomena, which seem to set at defiance the special laws of nature, we must distinguish between the honest experimenter who may be self-deceived, and the mere charlatan who employs his own ingenuity and skill for the deception of others. The two *cannot* be classed together, although the results obtained may be precisely alike. The second has availed himself of the credulity of mankind, with the view of gaining notoriety, or, which is more frequently the case, of filling his coffers. The first honestly tries to free himself from prejudice,—labors to benefit his fellow-men by what he supposes to be a real power in his possession, and is fully entitled to our respect for his motives and his sincerity, however erroneous we may find his conclusions. The second deserves no

mercy at our hands, and when the deception is detected, is fully entitled to all the scorn that is an imposter's due.

Let us now, having thus described in a brief and condensed way some of the most striking instances of the employment of the divining rod, direct our attention to an examination of its nature, the manner of its employment, the various theories that have been advanced as to the cause of its action by different classes of experimenters, and the explanations which modern science furnish us at the present time. In this way we shall best be enabled to derive important information on the subject, and to strip it of all marvellous character. We are probably in possession of such knowledge as to justify the belief, that the time has arrived for such clear and deliberate examination, as the excited prejudices of the past would not allow our predecessors.

As to the material of which the divining rod was composed, there was much difference of opinion among those who employed it. Agricola—a writer on metallurgy in the seventeenth century—mentions the use of hazel as specially adapted for the detection of silver, ash for copper, pine for lead, iron for gold.* The willow, elm and ash were employed at times in default of the hazel. Some insisted upon the almond tree, because the rod of Aaron which had been placed in the temple, "had brought forth buds, and bloomed blossoms, and yielded almonds," although they did not deign to show how there could be a connection between the manifestation of the Almighty's selection of the tribe of Levi to conduct "the priest's office for everything of the altar," and the search after precious metals. But, whatever wood was selected, it was necessary that it should be light and very porous, as it was presumed that its movement over the substances sought for was in consequence of the liquids it contained. The nature of the wood was, however, considered of very little importance by

* Etenim coryli virgulas adhibent ad venas argenti: fraxini, ad aeris: piceastri, ad plumbi, maxime candidi: ex ferro vel acie ferri factas, ad auri.
Agricola, De Re Metallica, 26.

the Dauphinese diviners, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. As we have already remarked, a cabbage stalk proved quite as effective as a rod of any of those woods, which were at first considered only available for divining purposes. As the rod could be of any material whatever, all questions concerning the relation between nature and properties were then settled, or at least considered as of no importance.

The rod was forked at one end. It was prepared by the German miners, by being exposed to certain cabalistic rites; or prayers were offered up, invoking a blessing on the rod. It was to be cut off at one stroke of the knife, at the rising of the sun on a Wednesday morning. Some claimed that it should be cut in the wet months, and others during dry seasons. That it should be forked, was not absolutely necessary, according to Agricola, for he says, "although the forked form may be employed, yet that is not of importance, for it may be straight or of any other shape, —the figure is of no importance, but the incantations, which he is not allowed, and does not wish, to narrate.* Most operators, according to Figuier, "selected a forked rod, or one at least having a crook at one of its ends; some, in accordance with the German method, took a small straight rod, a single shoot, without knots, divided into two, and making a hole in the end of one of the pieces, trimmed the other to a point and stuck it in this hole, making a jointed rod—*fuseau magique.* The great diviners, however, especially those of later times, used a straight rod, without bend or crook, a little curved about the middle, or perfectly straight."

The mode of holding the rod also differed. When a forked rod was used, it was seized by both hands, so that

* Virgula divina, quâ incantatores scrutantur venas, aut annulis etiam, speculis, cristallis, quamvis forma furcae figurari possit, nihil tamen ad rem interest, recta sit, an in aliam figuram formata: *non* enim valet virgulae figura, sed incantamenta carminum, quae mihi commemorare non licet neque libet.

De Re Metallica 27.

the back part of the latter was towards the ground. Of course with the jointed and straight rods, different methods of holding these would be adopted. Agricola suggests that they should be held gently, not too gently, however, since in that case they would fall toward the earth, even before the power of the hidden metallic veins would act upon them; and if they were held too tightly, the strength of the hands would overcome the attractive force of the objects sought. He gives a wood cut representing two diviners with forked rods in their hands, looking as grave and dignified, as became their occupation. The character of the operator seems to have been of some account, and to have influenced very much the motions of the rod—Virgula igitur, in auriinveniendis venis, *viro bono gravique* usu iesse potest. Cicero wondered if soothsayers could look each other in the face without indulging in smiles at the tricks and deceptions they had been engaged in playing on their fellow citizens. But the soothsayers had even more excuse for their mode of procedure than some of the charlatans, who have figured with the divining rod. It is difficult so to transplant ourselves from the incredulous present into the credulous past, as to picture to our minds the astonished expressions of the people, when watching the movements of the employer of the divining rod, they would suddenly see it dipping towards the ground, and hear the oracle declare, with all the appearance of authority, the nature of the substance concealed at that spot. Goldsmith's description, of the effect of the old schoolmaster's learning on the villagers, may possibly give us a picture of the effect produced by such a sight;

> "Words of learned length and thundering sound
> Amaz'd the gazing rustics rang'd around,
> And still they gaz'd and still the wonder grew,
> That one small head could carry all he knew."

It is natural to suppose that all the theories, propounded with the view of explaining the action of the divining rod, must have been crude and unsatisfactory. It is always so, when a new subject is presented to the attention of man.

A superficial glance, instead of a careful examination, inclines him to the reception of the whole as truth. This is the first mistake, one not only constantly made by particular individuals, but by mankind in general. Either the whole of a novelty is swallowed as an absolute verity, or it is rejected as unworthy of notice. We are either intensely credulous or incredulous. The mind deduces conclusions before it has had the proper data furnished it for the purpose. Indeed time is always demanded for ascertaining what are data, and what mere specious forms. The history of every science shows the great trials it has had to undergo, from prejudiced enemies and rash friends, one condemning wholesalely and the other adopting all appearances as truths. This is true with regard to the divining rod. Indeed it would be easier to believe all the powers asserted to belong to the rod, than to adopt the theories that either the clergy or the laity propounded as to the cause of its action. They only show the ignorance of their authors and give us no aid in our attempt to get a true theory on the subject.

First among these theories was that propounded by the clergy, attributing the movements to diabolical agency. The idea, that the powers of heaven could have any thing to do with the rod, was peremptorily disposed of in this way,—heaven could not be interested in the subject, therefore the lower regions must. The only duty of good men in this view of the matter was, to aid in delivering devout persons from this unfortunate gift, which could only be possessed in consequence of some voluntary or involuntary *pacte* with the Devil.

Malebranche at first admitted that it might be possible, that the rod was deflected over metallic veins and springs, but when he learned that, in Dauphiny, it was deflected towards robbers and thieves, he refused to admit the apparent phenomena, "and not being able by the force of reason alone to explain the effects that had been duly attested, he also attributed these to the agency of the devil." He says, "one should have a general horror of any

thing that proceeds from him, upon whom God has pronounced an eternal anathema."

The supposition of diabolical agency prevented that kind of investigation, which would have collected facts of a character to show the true nature of the supposed wonders of the divining rod. Besides the latter, in its legitimate province, as a means of discovering metals and hidden springs, did not show any greater power than the magnetic needle,—did not even possess as much of the marvellous, and yet no one felt like attributing the polar direction of the needle to such agency. The moral revelations of the divining rod were so evidently mere pretensions that it was necessary to claim Satanic influences as their exciting cause. But when the clergy had once promulgated this idea, of course it gained ground and closed up all examination of the subject.

The next theory claiming attention was that of the abbeède Vallemont. This is a most amusing attempt at an explanation of the movements of the rod. "By a species of insensible transpiration there is continually given off from bodies, material particles, which rise in the air following a vertical direction. In their course they come into contact with the divining rod, saturating it and causing it to rise or to fall in order to assume a direction parallel with that of the corpuscles.. * * The operator, himself receiving these corpuscular emanations, communicates them, through the pores of his skin, to the rod, which then begins to turn in his hands." In consequence of the difference in the pores of the skin, some men are skillful with the divining rod, and others entirely devoid of skill. In order to make the theory meet all possible cases, it is only necessary to suppose that the corpuscular emanations, given off from subterranean springs, metallic veins and other treasures of nature, differ in character, as well as those which are given off from the bodies of robbers, assassins, and all other perpetrators of crimes. Those from the bodies of murderers are particularly powerful on the nervous sensibility of men, like Aymar, able to use the divining rod for

their detection. They produce the terrible uneasiness which he experienced—the horrible agitation of his body, the painful sensations which manifested themselves throughout his whole system. While ordinary emanations only affected the rod,—these would produce what might be called "the very torrent, tempest and whirlwind" of suffering.

It is difficult to keep one's gravity at this most ludicrous attempt at an explanation. We are bewildered amid the multitude of special emanations, with which we must be surrounded, without our knowledge, at all times. Every substance in nature contributes to this collection. The particles must have the power of passing through each other, unaffected by winds and heat, unperceived by ordinary mortals. The earth is a grand manufactory of annoyances to the nervous system of the sensitive employer of he divining rod; every animal that sports in the air contributes to his uneasiness, and the perpetrators of crimes furnish the most painful of all corpuscular emanations to his sensibility. If all this had been presented to us in the region of fiction, we would consider it somewhat ingenious, but when it challenges our credence on the score of scientific explanation it is simply ridiculous. It is true,

> There are more things in heaven and earth,
> Than are dreamt of in our philosophy,

but this theory accumulates them in such quantities, that the human mind can not tolerate the conception. We have read somewhere of the man who had learned, from the teachings of the microscope, the wonders of the animalculae that live out their brief existence in the water and the air,—that infest in millions articles of food and drink, who was so appalled by the dangers surrounding him from these sources, that he refused food and drink and died from starvation—in order to escape the liabilities to injury arising from these sources. Only imagine the case of a man, who had suddenly become cognizant of the wonderful potency of these infinitesimally small material emanations on his nervous

system. What tortures his life would abound in,—what a release death would be to such a constant sufferer!

The best plan of examining the pretended power of the explorers is to look more carefully into their mode of procedure. How could the explorers know what was the particular body which attracted the rod so powerfully? How distinguish between the metals and water, and how distinguish one metal from another? Three rules were adopted for this purpose. *First;* the rod only bent when it was held over the particular substance, which the explorer was seeking. Hence his will must be active,—his intention fixed on the certain object. The same rod would answer for all possible investigations, in the hands of a skillful man. When he wished to seek for concealed springs, then it would turn over water and not over metals, and vice versa. If employed with the view of detecting murderers —nothing but the object in view—the perpetrator of the crime could affect it; passing over water, or mines of inexhaustible wealth, would not cause it to deviate from the direct path of its duty. It will be perceived, that a wonderful amount of intelligence, as well as resolution, was attributed to the rod by its partizans. Either the rod or the corpuscles might be considered as very obedient servants to the will of the explorer. A *second* method was by physical experiment. "Whenever the rod began to bend over any place, to know whether water or a metal was concealed, it was only necessary to place a piece of moist paper or linen on the rod. If the movement continued, the concealed article was water. If the contrary, a metal or at least something else than water. To ascertain then what metal it was, different metals would be successively brought near the rod. Its motion would be checked when metals different from that concealed were brought near it; and, on the contrary, the same kind of metal would cause it to turn. The *third* rule prescribes the very opposite of the last: the rod should *not* turn on bringing near it a piece of metal of the same kind as that concealed in the earth, but should turn for all other kinds. These two last pre-

cepts re-establish belief in the sympathies and antipathies of metals and non-metallic substances, an idea of the middle ages which has been for a long time the object of ridicule."

The art of Rhabdomancy thus exhibits its errors and the fallacious reports of its cultivators, as soon as it attempts to explain the results alledged to be obtained by its processes. Neither the theological explanation, nor the corpuscular theory, nor the scientific statement of its rules, present it, in any way, so as to command our respect. Decided and firm opposition to it, however, increased the number of its believers. We are always prone to side with the weaker party. Our interests may be furthered by arraying ourselves under victorious banners, but the lowest passions of our nature are nurtured and strengthened when we find an opportunity to denounce the successful and triumphant. This is seen in the change of sentiment in the people towards the perpetrator of a foul murder. So long as he is at large, all voices unite in condemning the act and declaring that condign punishment must be his reward. When, however, after a fair trial the sentence of law has been pronounced, then our sympathies are arrayed on the side of the criminal, and we pray the executive authority to remember mercy and release him from the penalty. Then we can find excuses of various kinds to explain away the heinousness of the offence, and to justify the commission of the murderous deed. A quack may trifle with the health or morals of the public by erroneous medical or theological teachings, and he will neither receive sympathy or countenance from the public; but only let those, whose life-study has been the proper elucidation of such subjects, attempt to have the proper measure of condemnation or punishment meted out to him, and crowds rally under his banner ready to do battle in his cause. All this looks very much like real, hearfelt sympathy, true philanthropic feeling for those who are persecuted. It is nothing but the rebellion of humanity against law and authority,—the exhibition of the spirit of disregard for law and

authority which tends to make a nation a byword and reproach.

So long as the wise and discreet opposed rhabdomancy with any fierceness, although proofs of the deceptions practiced by Aymar and his followers were collected in formidable array, although religious scruples were aroused by the theory of Satanic agency, although archbishops, bishops and divines without number discountenanced the divining rod, although Cardinal Le Camus denounced those who employed it within his diocese, and the inquisition in 1701 condemned the works written in its defence,—still, despite all these, the very opposition excited "a crowd of distinguished and worthy people, and among them even ecclesiastics of all degrees, who would declare the fact that the divining rod did move and, notwithstanding all statements to the contrary, in the words of Galileo, *E pur si muove.*" "The phenomena presented by Bleton in France and Pennet and others in Italy, could not be contested. To explain these Doctor Thouvenel conceived the theory which attributes all these phenomena to electrical action." Science was called in to aid in explaining that which science had been forced to condemn.

Thouvenelis theory was considered applicable both to the metal-seekers and the hydroscopists or water-seekers. Metallic veins and subterranean streams of water were supposed to eliminate electrical currents, which acted directly on the bodies of the employers of the divining rod, imparting to them peculiar influences which caused the motions of the rod. They penetrated the body, traversed the lungs, and, acting through the nervous system, produced the wonderful impressions, which manifested themselves in the case of Bleton and others of his class. Thouvenel justified his theory by directing attention to the fact, that occasionally wonderful exaltations of the senses were manifested in certain individuals, so that sight or hearing was wonderfully acute, or touch was so delicate that astonishing results were manifested in this way. But notwithstanding this reference, we must judge of scientific theories

by scientific laws, and in this way we shall find that his imposing scientific fortifications and warlike array (*l'echafaudage scientifique*) in defence of rhabdomancy will fall at the first fire from the unerring batteries of science. We could not *argue* with the corpuscular emanations of the abbé de Vallemont. They were too refined and delicate for the cognizance of our reasoning faculties,—too ethereal to be adjudged by laws of matter. But electric currents can be made subjects for argument,—are open to experiment and susceptible of positive demonstration. They always need conducting bodies to form the paths along which they should travel, and it is a fair subject of inquiry—what is the conducting body between the hidden water and the experimenter. But there is nothing, between the experimenter and the metallic treasure or the water, except the soil and the atmosphere. The former is an excellent conductor of electricity, and would speedily distribute it, if given off from the objects in question, throughout its immense mass, while the air, being a bad conductor of electricity unless in a moist condition, could not be employed at all in this particular business. And besides all these considerations, why should concealed streams of water produce such wonderful effects on the nervous system, when large bodies of water, directly exposed to the atmosphere, failed to produce any effect at all. In truth, directly the touchstone of science is applied to the so called scientific explanation of the matter, we find all its glitter disappears and it presents a mass of base tinsel instead of the pure gold promised us.

In 1826 the divining rod made its appearance again in France. No longer known by its old name, which had become unfashionable, but as the forked baton or *furcelle*, claiming notice under the patronage of Count *J. de Tristan*. The employer of the instrument was called *bacillogire* or bacillogyrator, and the term rhabdomancy exchanged for that of *bacillogyration*. *A rose by any other name will smell as sweet.* Tristan's theory is full of Thouvenel's idea of the existence of electrical currents, and yet we find the same objection to both,—no proof of the existence of such cur-

rents is furnished us. The electroscope, by which the most delicate waves of electrical excitement are made manifest, is not employed by Tristan, and we find ourselves, while studying his demonstrations, somewhat in the same condition as though we attempted to study the Arabian Nights by the aid of modern science,—to ascertain, for instance, how, in one moment after Aladdin had given the order, to the slave of the lamp, to bring him something to eat, "the genius returned with a large silver basin, which he carried on his head, and twelve covered dishes of the same material filled with the nicest meats, properly arranged, and six loaves as white as snow upon as many plates; two bottles of the most excellent wine, and two silver cups in his hand."—All discussions of this kind might have pleased the schoolmen of the middle ages, but we must know whether the thing to be examined be real, before we commence an examination of its nature, or attempt to explain the laws of its existence. Until we find a *chimera ruminans in vacuo*, it is a matter of no moment to us to know whether *devoret secundas intentiones.*

Before we give our own opinion on the movements of the divining rod, when found in the hands of the trustful and honest, in order to complete the general survey of the subject, contemplated in this article, it will be necessary to notice the *pendule explorateur*, which attracted some attention in Munich and Paris, and which involves the same principles as the divining rod. The instrument consists of a cube of iron pyrites, or a crystal of sulphur or of one of the metals. This was attached to slightly moistened thread, half an ell in length. When held between the fingers, over water, or any of the metals, "it would insensibly begin to form eliptical oscillations, which would become circular, and more and more regular. The movement around the north pole of the magnet, would be from left to right and from right to left, around the south pole." This subject was investigated carefully by many scientific gentlemen. Complicated theories were offered by way of solving it. It was considered that the movements were pro-

duced by a combination ef electricity and organic force, which united force was styled *organ-electric*. The theory was more imposing than Thouvenel's, only because more high-sounding words were employed. It was no more entitled to respect, and science soon stripped it of its bright attractions.

Chevreul proved by experiment that "the movement of the pendulum was not determined by the action of any body placed either below or in the vicinage of the oscillating pendulum. The motion proceeds from the hand, and only from the hand of him who holds the thread of the pendulum. The experimenter exercises this action in a manner involuntary and perfectly without his knowledge. The action results from very small movements or simple *muscular tensions*, determined by the will or thought or any other moral agency. From this arises a slight motion, producing a feeble muscular impulse. A number of the latter added together produce a mechanical effect, which manifests itself in the oscillations of the pendulum."—These conclusions were arrived at by Chevreul in experiments carefully made by himself. He observed that the same motions were produced in his own case as in the case of others. It occurred to him that they might be produced by the mind, intensely anxious as to the experiment, unconsciously acting on the hand. To satisfy himself on this point, his eyes were blindfolded,—the pendulum then remained at rest. In every case, when an experimenter was blindfolded, the movements of the pendulum ceased. Deprived of the sight of the pendulum, the mind could obtain no idea as to its condition, and the same amount of determination to keep the hands at rest was effectual in preventing motion, although it seemed to be of no account when the pendulum was full in sight. We are indebted then to Chevreul for directing attention to the fact that motions may be made by portions of the body, even without the aid of the will, and that other mental faculties may act on the voluntary muscles, bringing them into full play even when the individual is perfectly

unconscious of this action. This principle may be usefully employed in investigating the singular phenomena, connected with the movements of tables and other articles of furniture, which have been, by some, attributed to supernatural powers. We shall find that most of these phenomena, which are not voluntary frauds are involuntarily such from the muscles of both hands and feet being put into action, by other mental faculties than the will. The *involuntary complicity* of thought, thus referred to, can now be applied to the examination of the movements of the divining rod. In order to be as brief as possible we shall use the explanation, or rather application of Chevreul's explanation as furnished by M. Figuier.

"Among the numerous adept practitioners with the divining rod, a small number only are impostors,—the larger number act with sincerity. The divining rod does turn in their hands, independent of all artifice, and the phenomena, be they what they may, are real; this movement of the rod, however, by virtue of an act of thought and without any consciousness, on their part, of this secret action of their will. Natural indications, such as the presence of very rich green grass, the slope of the soil, the moisture of neighboring places, &c., but more frequently still the unwished for desire, the idea that the phenomena will take place, these provoke, all unknown to the experimenter, the rotation of the rod,—that is, they cause very small muscular movements which suffice to produce, by accumulation, a slight mechanical effect, which, disturbing the equilibrium of the rod, causes it to executé the motion that follows these involuntary acts."

With this explanation we can understand how prayer would be all powerful in removing the faculty of using the divining rod in hydroscopy. The very determination, associated with a belief in the efficacy of a higher power to deprive them of what they had learned to consider as of Satanic origin,—these would make the mind so on the alert that all involuntary complicity would be prevented, and the divining rod would cease to move in their hands.

The wish that the movement would take place, the desire to witness the phenomena, the intention, if we may so call it, being absent no movement was produced.

There has alway been a difficulty in examining this subject, in consequence of the want of some mode of explaining the movements of the divining rod when in the hands of those, whom we know to be above all suspicion of dishonesty. This want is now supplied, and we feel that it relieves us of the necessity of keeping quiet on the subject. There are some pretenders, whose very manner will create suspicion, and although we may not be able to detect them in their fraud, yet we feel more than half assured that fraud there is. Such were the astrologers and wonder-workers of the past, who would

* "question Mars, and, by his book,
Detect who 'twas that nimm'd a cloak
Make Mercury confess, and 'peach
Those thieves which he himself did teach.
They'll find i' th' physiognomies
O' th' planets, all men's destinies,
Like him that took the doctor's bill;
And swallow'd it instead o' th' pill;
* * *
They'll feel the pulses of the stars,
To find out agues, coughs, catarrhs,
And tell what crisis does divine
The rot in sheep, or mange in swine;
* * *
What makes man great, what fools or knaves,
But not what wise, for only of those
The stars (they say) cannot dispose.
No more than can the astrologians;
There they say right, and like true Trojans."

The coincidences between the movements of the rod and the presence of water are few in comparison with the cases where movements without the presence of water have taken place. The former are recollected and are quoted as of far more importance than the failures. The successful ticket in a lottery always produces more excitement than the numberless tickets which have proved blanks at the drawing. It constitutes the shallow basis on which men

calculate their probabilities of success. The successful treatment of one case by the quack gives him more reputation than is sufficient to cover up the bad effects of his failures, and makes him a reputation for shrewdness and ability which quiet practitioners of medicine fail to attain. When we prove that a thing is improbable, or a pretended science false, it is not incumbent on us to show why certain results of a different charaeter have been obtained; for, even despite improbabilities, sequences may occur not necessarily consequences of the previous course pursued. Instances illustrating this position are by no means few or rare. Hence while we are not obliged to pronounce a man a charlatan who employs the divining rod in searches after metals or water, it is not necessary for us to explain how it is that the rod has been deflected from its position over places where these have been afterwards found, since the number of such cases is very small and, when examined with scientific care, they may all be included in the category of accidental coincidences. The day has passed when we could admit any thing as a cause which reason will not allow us to connect directly and necessarily with the pretended effect.

Frederick City, Md. L. H. S.

ART. III.—LITURGICAL WORSHIP.*

When we examine the earliest history of the German Reformed Church in this country, we find much, that especially in this age of re-awakened churchly feeling, should arouse us to earnestreflection ; and on this account. Special importance attaches to the following facts :

The pioneers of the Church brought with them to this western land a Christian view of the Church, based upon those principles in the word of God which our Church appropriates as peculiarly her own. They felt the necessity of establishing churches and Christian schools wherever they settled. These Churches, although in no connection with the mother Church in Europe, and scarcely known to each other, grew, like scattered seeds, each one for itsef, as it was able, from which was to be developed a united Church of the future. They preserved with great solicitude the faith and Church of their fathers. Their helps to this end, in connection with the Bible, were their hymnbooks and liturgies, which may yet be found, here and there, as venerable relics of an age true to the faith of the Church.

The mother Church in Germany and Switzerland finally turned her eyes towards her youthful daughter in the wilds of distant America, and supported by the venerable Synod of Holland, sent laborers into this new vineyard of the Lord, who sought out these scattered churches and brought them into closer communion with each other.

The Rev. Michael Schlatter from St. Gallen in Switzerland, was particularly successful in uniting the different congregations into a Classical and Synodical union which

* A discourse on Acts 2 : 42, prepared and published by Rev. J. S. Kessler, D. D , in the German language, at the request of members of Goshenhoppen Classis, German Reformed Church. Translated by Cyrus V. Mays, A. B.

was never afterwards entirely sundered. Through him also, the union with the mother Church for the first time became regular and beneficial. This blessed connection was afterwards for a long time broken off by the American Revolution. During this isolation a strict orthodox faith was indeed preserved, but side by side with this, there also sprang up a sad ignorance, and the churchly life that once bloomed so beautifully threatened to wilt and die.

During the first twenty years of the present century, New-England Puritanism and Methodism introduced an active life into this state of decay, but a life for which the Church paid dearly; for with it there came also an unhealthy fanatical piety—a piety growing out of artificial religious incentives, rather than out of the pure Word of God and the ordinary means of grace. This piety was only too readily exchanged for the quiet, yet powerful grace of God. The Reformed conception of the Apostolic Church, and the beautiful liturgical services of our fathers were on this account for the greater part lost to us. From this, too, proceeds the nakedness and coldness of public worship in our time. This is the reason why the congregation takes so little part in the worship of the sanctuary, as if it had not met for the purpose of worshipping and praising God, but could hand over this sacred service, this great privilege to the choir, or omit it altogether. Hence, also, it no longer appropriates, as its own, the prayers of the Church of all ages as they are expressed in its liturgy, but leaves the duty altogether to the arbitrary will of each pastor. From this, too, it comes that men understand the service of the sanctuary to consist merely in listening to the sermon, which is, and should be, nothing more than an admonition and encouragement to consecrate our whole lives to the worship of God.

But God did not suffer the Church in this country to sink altogether, neither did He allow our denomination to perish. Especially during the last twenty years has our Church become more and more conscious of her peculiar life, and of her mission in this country. In consequence

we have again turned back and asked for the lost treasures of our Church—her hymn-books and liturgies. Our Synod gave practical encouragement to this tendency by appointing a Committee to prepare a Liturgy, which, after long and extensive labors, has very successfully completed its work.

Our Church having departed so far from the spirit of our fathers, and even here and there, shown a tendency to ignore it altogether, nothing less could be expected than that the appearance of this liturgy should be looked upon as a new thing, and by many as a bold innovation, in view of which, many called, but also uncalled for voices allowed themselves to be heard.

Beloved Brethren! Since we are here assembled for the purpose of deliberating on the advancement of the kingdom of God, and since it is in liturgical worship that the universal Church gives expression to her penitence, her faith, her prayers, and her praises, and through which the individual worshipper feels himself united with the visible and invisible members of the Church of Christ, and with them approaches the throne of God in humility and sorrow to confess his sins; to present to the Lord his prayers and intercessions, his thanks and his praises, and to seek his grace and protection for the future, it will not be deemed improper to speak a word on Christian Cultus—Church worship or the liturgy. We shall, therefore, by the grace of God, consider as our theme—the *liturgy with special reference to the minister as a liturgist.*

I. What are we to understand by the term liturgy?

II. Should a liturgy be used in public worship?

III. What is demanded of the minister as a liturgist?

1. "And they continued," &c. These words lead us to consider the results produced by the preaching of Peter on the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem. They serve to give us an insight into the life of the first Christian Church at Jerusalem founded by the Spirit of God through the instrumentality of the Apostle's preaching. Here we have the beginning, as it were, the germ of the Christian Church,

which, according to Protestant, and especially Reformed views, is a communion of such persons as believe in Christ and feel themselves called and driven to give evidence of their faith according to established rules, in public worship as well as in their lives. Such a Church did the Spirit of God plant in Jerusalem through the preaching of Peter as a seed from which the Christian Church was to grow up, like a tree, whose branches should cover the whole earth.

As the words of the Apostle exhibit to us the beginnings of the Christian Church in her outward form, so do they also show us the first elements of Christian Cultus. By Christian Cultus we understand the form of Christian worship—a form, however, that is not to be left to the arbitrary will of the individual minister, but which is the product of the reigning spirit of the Church, and which, on this account, the single congregation appropriates as coming from herself. A liturgy naturally unfolds itself from this Cultus; for the forms of public worship are not to be mere mute transactions, but must be clothed with words of instruction, of prayer, and of blessing. These words again are not to be left to the arbitrary will of the minister, but the Spirit that reigns in the Church takes them from the Word of God, gives them to the congregation as instructive and edifying forms of devotional exercises, and the congregation makes them her own, since they proceed from the Church. They become standing forms in the Church through which the congregation are called to express their devotion whenever they assemble for worship. Every individual finds in them all that he needs, since in the general parts of the Church are comprehended also those of the individual member, and in the balm that flows for all, each one finds a share. The beginning of a Christian Cultus is found already in the language of the Apostle.

It is said, "*They* remained." The pronoun "*they*" has reference to none others than those whom the Spirit, through the preaching of Peter, had collected from the world and had united into a living brotherhood in Christ. Their life had become changed; they had renounced the

service of the world, the flesh and the devil and had given themselves to Christ their Lord and Master by whose precious blood they had been purchased. Their new life, however, was not yet perfect in godliness; but as with all new converts, was yet in its infancy—in the germ, and needed continual nourishment in order to its growth; so that "they might come unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." The living fountain from which, by faith, they drew sustenance for their young life, was Jesus Christ Himself.

Just as the Spirit of God, through faith in the preached word of our Saviour had united them into a living brotherhood in Christ, so did he also unite them still closer to Christ by outward bonds—bonds which preserved them as a community in continual intercourse with Him. These bonds were the means of grace, the Bible, Charity, the Sacraments and prayer or Cultus.

"They remained in the *doctrine* of the Apostles." Not in the doctrine that every one might proclaim according to his own private judgment; but they remained in the Apostles' doctrine. According to their own enunciation and the teachings of the Apostles, the substance of this doctrine was Jesus Christ, the crucified One. The Apostles proclaimed all that referred to Him in the sayings of the Prophets: they taught the history of His birth and life; His teachings, sufferings, death, resurrection and ascension, and finally they exhorted men to repentance and faith. This was the teaching of the first Church at Jerusalem. Here we find a complete pattern for a Christian sermon with respect to a liturgy. Of this, however, we shall speak hereafter. The sainted Rauch presents this truth very forcibly in his sermon, "Every man is the Lord's in life," where he says, "The life of Christ; his sufferings, death, and resurrection; the nesessity of repentance, regeneration and faith must be the constant theme of the minister."

"They continued in the *fellowship*." As the Spirit of God had united them into a living fellowship in Christ, so he also constrained them to give proof of this fellowship by

an outward form. They all acknowledged themselves members of the one spiritual body of Christ. In the suffering of the individual member, they realized the suffering of the whole body; and in the joy of the one, the joy of all. On this account they supplied the necessities of all, thus causing the members of Christ's body to rejoice. That this brotherly fellowship no longer exists among us, and that the State must minister to the wants of the poor through paid officers, is not to the credit of the Church, but is an evidence that the Christian churchly view and the Cultus of the Apostolic Church is lost to us.

"They continued in the *breaking of bread.*" The Holy Spirit had united them as a family consecrated to God. In the consciousness of this family relation they held daily common meals—love feasts—*agapae*—at the close of which they celebrated the Holy Communion in mutual remembrance of the expiatory sufferings and death of our Saviour. It may be confidently accepted that in this too, the form was not left to the arbitrary judgment of the individual, but rather, that they celebrated it as our Lord himself had instituted it; that they accompanied it with the words he used as they are recorded by the apostles and evangelists. So that here already we have a communion service and a communion liturgy.

Finally: "they continued in *prayer.*" Doubtless every member of this first Christian congregation poured out his heart in prayer to God in his own quiet closet and in the family circle; but with all this they still felt the necessity of social prayer for the strengthening of their common Christian life. That during these prayer-meetings they did not all pray confusedly is certain, since the Holy Spirit is a spirit of order and not of disorder. That some did give utterance to the ardent desires of their hearts in spontaneous prayers, before the assembly, may be admitted; but just as readily must we admit that already early they made use of permanent forms, in connection with their extempore prayers. They had our Lord's Prayer, the benedictions of the apostles, and for the singing of praises they

had the hymns of the angels, of Zacharias, of Mary and of Simeon, to say nothing of what they may have retained from the worship of the Jewish synagogue. It is, therefore, not venturing too far to admit that even here we have the commencement of liturgical prayers.

This explanation of the Apostle's language leads us now more directly to answer the question, "What are we to understand by a liturgy?" Wherever we find the existence of a living and energetic soul in a healthy body, it always makes itself known by its outward actions. This may be applied to the Church and the outward manifestations of her life; consequently to Christian Cultus. The Church is the communion of saints; and its end is to manifest and develop the higher life in Christ according to appointed means. The soul of the Church is the Christian religion, whose nature it is to establish a fellowship through which it reveals itself. According to this, religion operates through the Church as the soul operates through the body. As all general and organized life, as for instance that of the State, has its own common thought and action, so has also the Church, as such, her common thought and action. Her thought is embraced in her system of Christian doctrine, the basis of which, is the Word of God itself. Her action appears in the form of her devotional exercises, and both are expressed by the general term Cultus. Both, however, must be regarded as thought and action in Christ, since both have being and stability only in Him, and appear as his work in believers, wrought especially by his Word and Sacraments. Both exist in immediate connection with Him who is the head of the Church. Both, therefore, seek to unfold, promote and perfect the higher life in Christ in those who take part in worship; and, where this higher life already exists, they seek to exhibit it in the transactions of divine worship.

Christian Cultus may, therefore, be comprehended under two principal relations. In the first place it tends to awaken and perfect the Christian life which consists in faith that works by love. It designs to produce life where

it does not yet exist, and where it already exists to unfold and perfect it. In this relation Cultus is above all a school in the Church. As such we find it already among the apostles. They stood forth as teachers from the very beginning—for faith cometh by hearing, but hearing by preaching, and preaching by the Word of God. In the second place, where this higher life in Christ has come to consciousness and certainty in those who take part in the public worship of God, Cultus designs to give outward representation to this life and the feelings upon which it rests. In the first relation the minister only is engaged; in the second, however, the whole congregation acts with him. Both relations of this activity of the Church are exhibited in the liturgy; since on the one hand it is designed to be the form of all transactions belonging to the worship of God; and on the other accompanies these spiritual transactions with an instructive, devotional and edifying communication of the truth; so that the minister who reads the liturgy teaches, prays and blesses, not in his own name, but in the name of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently in the name and according to the command of Christ himself. The life of the Christian Church is thus inwardly confirmed by a common knowledge, and outwardly represented by a common transaction. True knowledge is produced and preserved in its purity by the Word of God; and is proclaimed by means of the preaching of the Gospel. The last culminates in the sacraments. It must not be forgotten that equal dignity belongs to both, since they complete each other reciprocally and assist each the other in their activity. For this reason they must never be separated. The Roman Catholic Church, therefore, does injustice to the idea of worship, since in her Cultus she has almost entirely lost sight of the element of doctrine—the sermon, and permits the representative part of worship alone to prevail. In the Cultus of the Protestant Church the sermon has again assumed its place; and this is right, since intelligence is the sure and permanent foundation of our Christian faith and life.

But there is danger here of falling into the opposite extreme—namely, of allowing the sermon to crowd out the representative part of worship, which, as has been remarked, has already taken place in our country to a very great extent. The drowsiness and want of interest on the part of the congregation in the services of the sanctuary, when the sermon and all the transactions are left to the judgment of the minister, can be removed only by the introduction of a Christian protestant liturgy.

We have already partly explained the word liturgy in treating the general term Cultus. We shall, therefore, add only the following:

The word liturgy is derived from the verb λειτουργειν to transact openly, and from the substantive λειτουργια public transaction. In its most general sense the word denotes all public transactions. It is used in its more limited sense to denote the ministrations belonging to the house of God. Luke, 1: 2–5. It denotes exclusively the form of public worship. It includes the sermon, administration of the sacraments, singing and prayer, confirmation, marriage and funeral ceremonies, and all the transactions belonging to the public worship of God. A liturgy accordingly directs the minister how to proceed when during public worship he acts in the name of the congregation; or it is a directory for the proper discharge of the duties of the minister in ordering and carrying out the exercises of the sanctuary.

The history of Christian worship teaches us how a liturgy gradually proceeded from the bosom of the Church, and how it was accepted by her as a law for the transaction of her public worship. It shows us also how the Reformers purged it from all the additions that had been made by the church of Rome, and how the liturgies now used in the Protestant Church have gradually been developed. Liturgies, although by the operation of the Holy Spirit the product of the Church, are nevertheless not made equal to the word of God, nor considered beyond improvement.—Still the amendment or improvement of a liturgy must

not be undertaken by a single congregation, much less by a single individual—but is the work of the whole Church. In case of the necessity of any change, Synod appoints a committee of its most trust-worthy ministers who prepare and publish a liturgy, which, having been subjected to a general trial, is referred to the whole Synod for approval or rejection. If accepted, such a liturgy becomes the regular form for public worship.

Ought a liturgy to be used in public worship? On this question Dr. Palmer (Herzog's Real-Encyclopedia) speaks as follows: "This question is denied by certain religious parties, who, in their spiritual arrogance, boast of being so full of the Holy Ghost, that they would seem at all times to be provided with the anointed word. Some go so far in their hatred to every ecclesiastical form of worship that they will not repeat even the Lord's Prayer. Among all churches, the Church of Scotland alone, after using the Calvinistic forms of prayer which John Knox had brought with him, has within the last two centuries separated herself from these, as well as from all liturgical service. An account of travels in Scotland published in the Evangelical Church Paper in 1854 shows clearly in what all this has resulted. It necessarily follows that in proportion as the congregation is torn away from the general life of the Church, it is given over to the subjective impulses of the minister. The liturgy as the form of utterance which partly moulds and partly accompanies each ministerial act, must have truly objective force; that is, it must be given to the congregation by the Church through the coöperation of the Holy Ghost, and as such a gift it must be used devoutly. The congregation can accompany the minister in prayer only by the aid of an unchanging, ever recurring formula, whose force is inherent, whose form is not impressed with the peculiarities of any age, and which, by continual repetition embodies the devotional idea in spirit and in truth."

It is universally known that God through Moses prescribed the order of worship to the Jewish nation as well as

the liturgical form. The following may suffice to prove this. In Numb. 6: 22–26, we find that God directed the form of the blessing by which the people were dismissed from the temple. So in Deut. 31: 19. God commanded Moses to compose a song to be put into the mouth of the people that it might become their common language. The 15th, 20th and 122nd Psalms were intended for the congregation and the 113th and 118th Psalms had a liturgical position in the Jewish service. From this we learn that the worship of God in the Church of his people in the old covenant, which is the type of the Church of the new covenant, was already liturgical.

In Luke 4 : 16, and in other passages of the New Testament, we find that Christ took part in the worship of the Jewish synagogue as well as in the Temple. He censured the Jews for many things, and the Pharisees especially on account of their long egotistical prayers which were made at the corners of the streets and in the synagogues for the purpose of receiving praise of men. These prayers doubtless, were extemporaneous ; but he never censured them for any liturgical form that they may have used. When the disciples of our Lord asked him to teach them to pray as John also taught his disciples, he did not say: "In my Church there must be no formula," but gave them that most perfect of all prayers, the prayer that will continue to be used to the end of all time: "Our Father who are in Heaven."

The opponents of liturgical worship sometimes object to it, because of the opinion that liturgical prayers cannot come from the heart. No one will doubt that the prayers of Christ came from the heart; and above all those which he uttered in his last and most dreadful sufferings. Yet the words "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" are taken from the 22nd Psalm; and the last words that fell from his dying lips, "Father into thy hands I commit my spirit" are found in the 31st Psalm. Thus the Redeemer of the world died with a form of prayer upon his lips.

Since the apostles, like their divine master, were accustomed to the liturgical service of the Jews, we may confidently affirm that in the congregations which they planted liturgical service was the peculiar form of worship; and this our text clearly intimates. One circumstance must here be mentioned as a fact that goes far to confirm what has been said. In the ancient Church of the East there is a liturgy which is ascribed to the apostle James, and is regarded as the liturgy of the congregation at Jerusalem. Learned and devout historians say that the original text of this liturgy, though much enlarged to meet the necessities of the times, still, as to contents, form and expression, is a model liturgy. It is, therefore, an old and venerable witness of liturgical service.

That in the course of time liturgical service was very much disfigured by the Roman Church, is well known; but it is equally well known that the Reformers purged it from the additions that had been made, and as far as possible restored it to its original character. Liturgical worship, therefore, is old, and in view of its origin and history it is worthy of honor. Worship without a liturgy, the use of extemporaneous prayers only, is a human innovation, wanting in historical authority; an innovation that contradicts our nature and experience; because on the one hand we cannot conceive of any worship without form, and on the other, our experience teaches us that the sects, who in their false spiritualism have renounced the forms of the Church in their worship and life, cling with the most obstinate tenacity to their self-made forms. A single glance into their history will prove this.

A question, however, here forces itself upon us. Has the liturgy, where it exists, entirely set aside extemporaneous prayer in public worship? By no means. Such prayer finds an appropriate place after the text has been read, or after the exordium when the theme of the minister has been announced, and liturgical ministers generally take occasion to offer a free prayer at this point.

If, therefore, the congregation is liturgical the minister also is bound to be liturgical—a liturgist. The liturgy

gives him directions as to the proper mode of procedure in worship. In this connection we can only indicate what is demanded of him in particular liturgical transactions; and in the first place in that part of Christian worship in which he and the congregation are active at the same time, as for example, when conducting the service on Sunday or on festival days, or administering the sacraments; and in all the services of the sanctuary that are embraced in the general idea of consecration and blessing. In the next place we will state briefly what may be expected of him in the second part of worship which is to serve the Church as a school for the purpose of awakening and promoting Christian life. This has reference to the sermon in which the minister alone is active.

With reference to the first part, the minister must confine himself conscientiously to the whole prescribed form of worship, even as he must to the prayers and blessings. By this it is not meant to say, however, that he is to make no account of the particular occasions and peculiar necessities of the congregation—he shall do this, only not in such a way as to set aside the liturgy. If at any time an alteration of a part or the whole of the liturgy should be considered necessary, he must apply to the Synrd, and never, on any account, arbitrarily change the sacred order of the Church.

In the performance of public service, the reading of prayer and the pronouncing of the blessing, he must preserve himself free from all that is artificial in posture, mien and expression; shun all art with a view of exciting an interest by his own powers; he must perform his duties with an artless, reverential earnestness, conscious that before God and the congregation he is conducting not a service of his own, but an established service that is holy. And the spirit of earnestness and devotion will of itself pass over upon the congregation and both it and he will be edified.

With reference to the second part involving the sermon, in which thé minister alone is active, he must guard him-

self with equal care against all that is arbitrary and put himself entirely under the regulation of the liturgy. To this we refer more particularly, since the direction for preaching belongs to Homiletics. We are considering the sermon only in its liturgical aspects.

The words of St. Paul in his letter to the Romans—"Faith cometh by hearing" are by no means to be understood as having reference only to the origin of Christianity or to the spreading of it in the form of missionary labor; but they teach rather the all sufficient and fundamental law of the Church by which she fashions and develops her inner life. The Protestant Church has, therefore, again restored the sermon to its proper place in divine worship.

Since the sermon, as a source of religious instruction, in the worship of the Church, must above all work to the end that faith in the Saviour and in the coming of the kingdom of God, may increase and finally triumph, and that this faith may become the living principle in man of all his acting, the minister must proclaim the divine counsel of redemption in Christ, as this has been developed historically from the time when it was first proclaimed abroad until all shall be fulfilled. Sermons must not appear as a series of short disconnected expositions according to the inclination of the minister, but must rather in themselves tend to produce a system of worship. This thought lies at the bottom of the order of the Church year, the historical groundwork of which represents the life of Christ and the establishing of his kingdom upon earth. The festival days must be prominent as bright and radient points in the Church year, the annual celebration of which brings the life of our Saviour constantly before our eyes. The preparatory and intermediate periods should be filled out by presenting such general truths as are proper objects of Christian knowledge. With reference to liturgical worship, the subject of the sermon is regulated by the three chief festival periods of the Church—Christmas—Easter and Whitsuntide.

The first period begins with the festival of Advent, in which the celebration of our Saviour's birth is the principal point, and closes with the Epiphany. The subjects for the preparatory sermons embrace the prophetical announcements of Christ's coming into the world; the subjects for those of the day of the festivals relate to the history of his birth; while the appearance of the wise men from the east and other passages appointed by the Church close the Epiphany.

The festival of Easter celebrates the sufferings, death and resurrection of Christ. This festival commences with Lent and ends with Whitsuntide—so called from the white dress which was worn for the last time on this day by those catecumens who were baptized on Easter. The principal days of this festival are Good Friday and Easter. The subject matter for the sermons on this occasion, represents the sufferings, death and resurrection of Christ. Low Sunday has reference to the lesson contained in the 1st Epistle of John 5: 4–10 and in the lesson of the Gospel, as recorded by St. John 20: 19–31. It was regarded by the ancient Church as preparatory to the feast of the Ascension of Christ and the descent of the Holy Ghost.

Whitsuntide.—These are the days of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost and the establishment of the Church. The first two festivals embrace the whole life of Christ on earth from the moment of his birth to the time when he showed himself to his disciples as their risen Saviour. The third festival represents Him as ascended to heaven and sitting at the right hand of God, where he fulfills his promise to send the Comforter, and where he governs the Church as her invisible and divine head. This feast begins with Ascension day and closes with Holy Trinity. The middle point is represented more particularly by the day of Pentecost, the subjects for which are the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the establishment, preservation and government of the Christian Church. This festival has a solemn close in the celebration of the Holy Trinity. The subjects for sermons for this time embrace the account of

the ascension of Christ; the outpouring of the Holy Ghost and the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The time intervening between these festivities as noticed above, is taken up by presenting such truths as refer either to the past feast, or point to the one coming. The time between the feast of Trinity and the beginning of the Church year gives a fitting occasion for such general subjects as the Gospel lessons may indicate, or as the minister himself may draw from the unfathomable depths of inspiration.

If, in addition to this, the minister sustains a relation of complete living communion to his congregation, so that in his care for individual souls the general and prominent wants of the congregation become known to him; and if he seeks in his discourses to meet these wants, then will every member find his own words fully met in such discourses. Such sermons will make an impression upon his thoughts and feelings. They will expand his imperfect and limited veiws of religion and enliven all his better feelings; and thus through the reciprocal action of the pastor and congregation the religious life of the individual and of the whole congregation is continually rendered more and more perfect. This, in connection with what has been already said, expresses what we mean when we speak of the sermon in its liturgical aspect.

In this manner the preaching of the Word and the other parts of Christian Cultus, year by year, present to the eyes of each believer Jesus Christ as he is known to us in his blessed life and works; in his expiatory sufferings and death; in his glorious resurrection and ascension; in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and in the founding and preservation of his Church. The promise of Christ, "Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," bears to him a joyful certainty. He sees and feels Christ present and active in the Church to teach, to save, to protect and to sanctify. This binds him continually closer and closer to his Saviour, from whom he receives life and light, peace and salvation.

We close our discussion with the words recorded by Dr.

Olshausen in the exposition of our text, when he says: "Although the gospel teaches that God is to be worshipped in spirit, it yet requires an outward form of worship. The Redeemer designed to found a visible Church, which necessarily presupposes an external service of God—or Cultus. Worship, accordingly, exists in the Christian Church not only for the sake of the weak, but also for those most advanced, in whom the old natural man, that must have an outward form, still lives. Worship, too, is instituted not merely for the proclamation of the gospel to unbelievers, but it also embraces an element of pure adoration for the faithful. The worship of the Church is designed for a perpetual thank-offering of believers, which is presented to the Lord for his ever-during, valid sacrifice of propitiation, as it is said in 1 Peter 2: 5—To offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

Only such a service of God can exert a holy and saving influence upon our lives, so that we pass through our earthly pilgrimage as living members of Christ's body until at last all imperfection ceases, and that which is perfect appears; when it will be said, "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away. Behold! I make all things new. Amen."

ART. IV.—NOTES ON THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS.

[CONTINUED.]

V. 181. *δαιμόνων δέ που χάρις, κ. τ. λ.* has reference to the *σωφρονεῖν* of the preceding verse: "of Gods the grace (gift) this is forsooth" (*που*).—The verb *ἧμαι* is usually put with *ἐπί* and the genitive, more rarely, as here, with the accusative. So we find below v. 673 *σωτὴρ ναῦν θέλους' ἐφέζετο*; and Prometh. v. 389 *θακοῦντα πανκρατεῖς ἕδρας*.—The Scholiast makes *σέλμα=τὸν ζυγόν*, and adds *ὑφίζυγος γὰρ ὁ Ζεύς*. Aeschylus makes frequent use of this metaphor, by which the ruler of gods and men is represented as seated at the helm. In a similar manner the Romans applied the expressions *in puppi sedere* and *clavum tenere* to the chief magistrates of the commonwealth. The gods generally are here represented as "all-powerfully seated at (*βραίως . . ἡμένων*) the lofty helm," but commonly the figure is only applied to Jove.

V. 184. *ἡγεμὼν ὁ πρέσβυς, κ. τ. λ.* This sentence extends to v. 205, where *εἶπε* is the predicate of the main proposition, and where on account of the great length of the subordinate clauses, the poet finds it necessary to repeat the subject by his *ἄναξ δ' ὁ πρέσβυς*. The *τότε* of v. 184 corresponds to its correlative *ἐπεὶ* of v. 198. The *ἡγεμὼν νεῶν* here alluded to is Agamemnon. The Scholiast refers *ὁ πρέσβυς* to the age of the King: *μείζων γὰρ Μενελάου*, and Schütz renders likewise *natu major*, but this adjective is often used in such connections without the auxiliary conception of age, in the sense of "venerable."

V. 185. Blomfield wishes to read *οὔτινα φέγειν* or *οὔτιν' ἔφεγειν*; quite unnecessarily, as this would spoil the symmetry of the period. Stanley and Humboldt connect *οὔτινα* with *μάντιν*, *vatem neminem vituperans*, scheltend keines Sehers

Spruch. As Calchas, however, is the only prophet, whom the King could blame, *οὔτινα* may better be taken in the sense of *οὔ τι* or *οὔ τιν'*, *nullam ob causam*, *nequaquam*. Why Schneider should wish to supply *φόγον* after *οὔτινα*, so as to have a double accusative with *φέγων*, it is difficult to perceive. The clause may be regarded as expressing a *concession* or *limitation*, which is denoted by the *καί* of v. 184 used in the sense of *καίπερ*: "although casting no blame whatever on the seer," without attaching any blame to him. Cf. Rost Gr. Gramm. § 130.

V. 186—187. *συμπνέων=συμφωνῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἀνθιστάμενος*, (Scholiast) *conspirans, se accommodans, non repugnans*. Humboldt elegantly: Zufalls Fügung tragend still gefasst, submitting with calm composure to these sudden blows of destiny.—*ἐμπαίοις=ἐμπεσούσαις* (Schol.), a strong epithet used with reference to the suddeness and violence with which the blow of misfortune came upon him: *incidentibus casibus cedens.—κεναγγεῖ, vasa exhauriente*, store-consuming. —*βαρύνοντ'* for *ἐβαρύνοντο*, in the plural on account of the collective sense of *λεώς*.

V. 190—191. The Scholiast makes *ἔχων=ἐχόμενος*,—excellent, but unnecessary, for *ἔχειν* is here, as frequently elsewhere, used absolutely in the sense of *situm esse, aliquo loco degere, commorari*. It is therefore not necessary to supply, with Schneider, *αὐτὴν*, i. e. *τὴν ἄπλοιαν.—παλιῤῥόθοις, fluctu refluo madentibus, retro strepente fluctu madentibus*, said of the surge rolling to and from the shore, here of the place, where it happens, "flood-abounding, tempestuous, tide-lashed." Cf. Odyss. V. 430.

V. 192. The conjunction *δέ* is here equivalent to *γάρ for*. According to Kühner's Ausf. Gramm. § 736, 2 (Vol. 2), "*δέ* is frequently employed to denote the *ground* or *reason*, and then stands for *γάρ*, with this difference, however, that *γάρ* would represent the clause as logically dependent, whilst *δέ* makes it logically coördinate and of equal importance with that which it serves to explain."

The winds blowing from the Strymon were from the North and consequently adverse to those sailing from Troy.

These the poet now proceeds to designate with a profusion of forcible epithets, in order to exhibit their disastrous effect upon the army and perhaps to palliate the weakness of Agamemnon in yielding to its demand for the unnatural remedy. By bringing ungrateful leisure, fastings, unsafe anchorage, and uneasy apprehensions over men, and sparing neither ship nor cable, making time doubly heavy by reason of the detention, they caused the flower of the Argives to wither and decay. Wellauer, Bothe and others connect *δύσορμοι* with *ἄλαι*, and render: *importuosi hominum errores.* I prefer to separate them and to take *ἄλαι* in its figurative sense of "*mental wanderings*," i. e., "*anxiety, apprehension, distress.*" The adjectives, *κακόσχολοι, νήστιδες, κ. τ. λ.*, being susceptible of both an active and a passive signification, enhance the power of the delineation. The metaphor *ἄνθος Ἀργείων*, of which Aeschylus makes frequent use, e. g. Pers. 248 *τὸ Πέρσων ἄνθος*; Prom. 418 *Ἀραβίας ἄρειον ἄνθος*, &c., &c., is here as appropriate as it is beautiful: "Proprie enim venti floribus, quos discutiunt, nocent." Schütz.

V. 198. The *δέ* of this passage is opposed to the *although* implied in the clause *μάντεν οὔτινα φέγων* of v. 185, and is rendered by "yet, still." *ἄλλο* implies that the proposed remedy of the bitter distress occasioned by the storm would only be another evil, more aggravating even than the former. It may be translated by "besides, in addition to the bitter storm." Hesychius defines *βριθύ* by *ἰσχυρὸν, μέγα, βαρύ*, and the Scholiast makes *βριθύτερον=ἐπαχθέστερον, more onerous* or *oppressive.*—*προφέρων*, "bringing forward, producing," Artemis, i. e., "appealing to her," either as the cause of this demand and for the purpose of shielding himself against odium, or with a view of threatening the leaders with her displeasure in case of disobedience.—*βάκτροις baculis*, h. e., scipionibus, sceptris: "Nam sceptra tum bacula erant, clavis aureis distincta." Blomfield. The striking the ground with the sceptre was an expression either of excessive grief or of anger. Thus it is said of Telemachus, Odyss. II. 8 *ποτί δὲ σκῆπτρον βάλε γαίῃ, δάκρυ' ἀναπρήσας.* Cf. also Iliad. I, 245.

V. 205. Here follows at last the apodosis of the long sentence, of which all the clauses from v. 179 are parenthetical. The *δέ* serves to resume the thread of the discourse: "Then, *I say*, the venerable king thus speaking, said."

V. 206. *κήρ* is made=*τιμωρία* by the Scholiast, with reference perhaps to the "punishment or revenge" that would inevitably follow his disobedience, both from the army and from the incensed divinity. But this is not necessary. *κήρ* in its general sense of "*lot, fate, misfortune*," covers the entire ground.

V. 207. *ἄγαλμα· πᾶν, ἐφ' ᾧ τις ἀγάλλεται.* Hesychius. "The ornament, jewel of my house." So Choëph. v. 198 *ἄγαλμα τύμβου τοῦδε καὶ τιμὴν πατρός.*

V. 208. *παρθενοσφάγοισι ῥεέθροις*, elegantly and forcibly for *παρθένου σφαγείσης ῥεέθροις*, *virginis occisae sanguine*, "with maiden-slaughter streams."

V. 212. *λιπόναυς*, *desertor classis.* Such a one, being subject to the *λειποναυτίου δίκη*, was visited with disgrace by the laws of the Athenians, precisely like a deserter in the army. *Λειποναυτίου μὲν ἐκρίνετο ὁ τὴν ναῦν ἐλλείπων, ὥσπερ ὁ τὴν τάξιν λειποταξίου.* Pollux 8, c. 6. Respecting those even, who deserted a vessel of any kind in time of danger from a storm, &c., there was a law condemning such delinquents to the loss of the vessel and cargo both: *δίδωσιν ὁ νόμος τὴν ναῦν τῷ ἐναπομείναντι.* Marcellinus in Hermogenem quoted by Spanheim.—*συμμαχίας ἁμαρτών*, not *socios amittens*, as Bothe has it, but *a sociis deficiens.* The verb *ἁμαρτάνω*, in its figurative sense of "trespassing or sinning against" (which I take to be its meaning here), is usually followed by *εἰς* or *περί* with the accusative, more rarely by the dative or the genitive. The passage then would be: "How can I become deserter of the fleet and sin against (turn traitor to) the cause of my confederates?" Schneider, however, justly observes, that *συμμαχίας* may also stand in the sense of "aid," "assistance," and in that case we would render: "failing to contribute my share of aid to my companions in arms?"

V. 215–216. The subject of this sentence is *ἐπιθυμεῖν*, its predicate *θέμις*, the copula being understood. "Ironice dictum, quo Diana tangitur." Bothe. But why *ironice?* or why any allusion whatever to Diana? The phrase *θέμις ἐστί* frequently occurs in Homer, and always in the sense of: "it is just, proper, allowed, sanctioned by existing institutions or by long-established custom," without any reference whatever to divine right or to right as such. Agamemnon wishes to say, therefore, that his associates in arms have a just claim, a right founded on established law and military custom to demand this sacrifice.

The *ὀργᾷ περιόργως* has given rise to much unnecessary controversy and confusion. Two of the earlier editions have *ὀργᾷ*, another *αὐδᾷ*, a word which the Scholiast likewise employs in his explanations. *ὀργᾷ· τῷ τρόπῳ γὰρ αὐδᾷ ὁ μάντις.* The Scholiast evidently regards *ὀργᾷ* as a verb from *ὀργάω*, of which he also seems to make *μάντις* the subject, instead of the more common *Ἄρτεμις*. Now if *ὀργᾷ* (sc. *Ἄρτεμις*) be taken as a verb, it will be necessary to put a comma after it, to connect *περιόργως ἐπιθυμεῖν θέμις* as an explanatory clause: "The wind-appeasing sacrifice, the virgin blood, namely, she angrily demands (aims at), and to cherish such violent desire is her prerogative." Pearson, Casaubon, Stanley and Ruhnken read *ἐπιθυμεῖ Ἄρτεμις*, and the rest as in our text. But Schütz, objecting to such violence to *θέμις*, and alleging, that, if the passage is corrupt at all, such corruption must lurk in the word *ὀργᾷ περιόργως*, changes the word *ὀργᾷ* without any authority, and gives us the alternative of reading either *ἀρχὰς περιόργως ἐπιθυμεῖν θέμις*, or else *παρθενίου θ' αἵματος ὀργᾶν, περιόργως τ' ἐπιθυμεῖν* (sc. *τοὺς ξυμμάχους*) *θέμις*. Now there is no doubt that *ἀρχὰς*, i. e. *τοὺς ξυμμάχους* is the subject accusative to *ἐπιθυμεῖν*, this giving us the most natural interpretation of the passage. But this subject accusative is to be *supplied* from the preceding sentence, or else the poet himself has left it indefinite and at the option of the reader to supply either this one or some other. There is, therefore, no ground for changing *ὀργᾷ*, nor

is there any corruption or difficulty in the expression *ὀργᾷ περιόργως*. Such emphatic repetitions of words of like or kindred signification are of frequent occurrence not only in Homer, but also in all the subsequent Greek authors, and especially in Aeschylus. Thus the Greeks say *μέγας μεγαλωστί* (Homer); *ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἀληθῶς* (Plato); *φύσει πεφυκώς* (Xenophon); *πλήθει πολλοί* (Herodotus); and our own poet has *πικρῶς ὑπέρπικρον*, Prom. v. 943; *οἶκτον οἰκτρόν ἀΐων*. Hiketid. v. 58; and *δύο λήμασι δισσούς*, Agamemnon. v. 121. On the nature and import of these apparent plenasms cf. Kühner's Ausf. Gr. Gramm. § 858. Bothe has raised another difficulty in regard to the accent of *περιόργως*, which, if derived from *περιοργής*, should have a circumflected ultima *περιοργῶς*, and suggests *περιέργως* from *περιέργον*, *immodicum*, *pravum*. This would not alter the sense materially. The passage then would read: "For to demand with angry eagerness (importunity) the wind-allaying sacrifice, which is the maiden's blood, is the army's right (just privilege)."

V. 216. *εὖ γὰρ εἴη· καλῶς ἀποβαίη*, Schol. "Vox bene ominantis, cum fati necessitate se coactum videt facere id, a quo abhorret." Bothe. Not an *excusandi formula*, by which the king desires to exculpate his associates, but an expression of resignation to his lot and of the wish, that after all it might end for the best, i. e., be attended with no pernicious consequences to himself. The expression is elliptical, and *γάρ* may be rendered by "well then" (Kühner's Gr. Gramm. § 754, Anm. 2, b.): "Well then (since I cannot avert it) may its issue be propitious, may it end for the best!" Haupt, who refers this prayerful wish to the chorus and not to Agamemnon, explains the ellipsis by rendering: (At deos nolo accusare), *nam* (ut verecunde loquar) *bene eveniat*.

V. 217–219. *ἀνάγκης ἔδυ λέπαδνον, κ. τ. λ.* The Scholiast interprets *ἠναγκάσθη ποιεῖν τροπαίαν μεταβολήν*. The term *λέπαδνον* properly denotes the thong, by which horses were fastened to the yoke or pole of the carriage, here = *ζυγόν*. The simile is one of frequent occurrence in the Greek

drama. "But when he had put on the thong," i. e., submitted to the yoke of necessity,—*πνέων*, "im Geiste athmend" (Humboldt), is said with reference to the gradual and silent origin of the change, to which as yet no utterance had been given.—*τροπαία*, sc. *πνοή*, is properly the wind that has inverted its direction, the return breeze from sea to land; here figuratively and generally "change, turn." So Choëphor. v. 773. *εἰ τροπαίαν Ζεὺς κακῶν θήσει ποτέ.* The accumulation of epithets *δυσσεβῆ*, *ἄναγνον*, *ἀνίερον*, and their relative position, one *before* and two *after* the qualified substantive, together with the asyndeton, render the expression peculiarly forcible and vivid: "irreverent change of mind, unchaste, unholy." In the same manner we have above v. 147. *θυσίαν ξτέραν*, *ἄνομον*, *ἄδαιτον.*

V. 220–221. *τόθεν . . . . μετέγνω.* Here begins properly the apodosis of the sentence, which has given rise to various interpretations. Blomfield improperly makes *παντότολμον* the subject and renders: *Exinde audacia sapientiam exuit.* Schneider connects *τό* and *φρονεῖν*, and makes *παντότολμον* adverbially dependent on the verb, like *κακὸν φρονεῖν*, etc. *Seitdem beurtheilte er anders das allkühn Gesinnt-seyn*, since then he judged differently of the being of all-daring mind, i. e., of desperate audacity. Now *μεταγιγνώσκω* implies a change of mind or purpose, founded on some knowledge or experience subsequent to that on which the original purpose was formed. Hence Hermann and Haupt correctly *mutato consilio decernere; φρονεῖν* here as frequently in the sense of *aiming at, planning, designing*, and *τὸ παντότολμον* object. This seems to be the most obvious and natural construction, and I am inclined to render with Hermann: *Exinde mutato consilio decrevit audacissimum facinus suscipere.* We must not suppose, however, that this interpretation completely removes every scruple in regard to the true import of this obscure sentence. Wellauer justly observes, that the words *φρενὸς πνέων τροπαίαν* and *τόθεν—μετέγνω* (when taken in Hermann's sense) involve a tautology. Moreover, the word *βροτούς*, which is now made

to depend on *θρασύνει*, is merely an emendation of Schütz, Hermann and Blomfield, in lieu of the more ancient *βροτοῖς*, which is found in all the earlier editions and manuscripts, and which it was customary to connect with the preceding verse, not with the parenthetical clause introduced by *γάρ*. Lastly, it has been a matter of dispute, whether the apodosis begins with *τόθεν* (a particle, seldom if ever used to denote the relation of *time*, but rather that of *casuality*: "whence, on which account, from which source"), or with *ἔτλα δ' οὖν* of verse 216. Voss, whose opinion on this subject is not to be despised, seems to have given to all these objections a positive value by making them the basis of his version, which I here submit in English to the option of the student: "But when he took upon himself the yoke imposed by dire necessity, breathing still rebellion in his mind (*τροπαίαν* in the sense of opposite gale), nefarious, corrupt, unholy, by which (i. e., under the influence of which necessity) men fall, as late he saw (*μετέγνω* in the sense of sero intelligere) into the most audacious crimes, for, &c. &c., then he dared (*ἔτλα δ' οὖν*), &c. &c."

V. 222–223. If the active sense of *θρασύνει* can be established, then the emendation of *βροτούς* for *βροτοῖς* becomes desirable; if not, then *βροτοῖς* here, as often the dative among the Tragedians,=*inter homines, humano in genere.*—*αἰσχρόμητις· αἰσχρὰ ποιεῖν ἀναγκάζουσα* (Scholiast), "prompting to base, disgraceful deeds."—*παρακοπὰ· τοῦ νοῦ παρακοπή* (Schol.), "frenzy, perversity, madness," which is called *τάλαινα* on account of the unhappy consequences that follow crime.—*προτοπήμων*, either "greater than all other miseries," as the Scholiast would have it, or else "the first cause of woe, primeval source of misery." The passage, therefore, would read in English: "for base-advising, sad perversity of mind, primeval source of misery, makes men (*βροτούς*) audacious, or grows bold in mortals (*βροτοῖς*)."

V. 224. *ἔτλα δ' οὖν*, "and consequently, sure enough, he dared," &c.—The accusatives *ἀρωγὰν* and *προτέλεια* here occupy the place of an appositional complement to the predicate of the foregoing sentence. When used in this manner,

the accusative denotes the consequence, destination, or purpose of the action expressed by the preceding predicate, or in other words the purpose or object aimed at. We may supply *ὥστε εἶναι*.. The use of this exegetical accusative is especially frequent among the Tragedians, as well as in Homer, who, however, sometimes actually supplies *ὡς ἔμμεναι* or *ἔμμεναι* simply. So Iliad. IV, 141. *παρήϊον ἔμμεναι ἵππων*; and Iliad. III, 50. *πατρί τε σῷ μέγα πῆμα . . . . . δυσμενίσιν χάρμα.* Cf. Kühner's Ausf. Gramm. § 500, Anm. 2, 3.—*γυναικοποίνων πολέμων*, i. e., *belli ad poenas ob mulierem raptam persequendas suscepti.*—*προτέλεια ναῶν*, "*sacrificia pro fausto navium egressu oblata*, pluralis pro singulari." Schütz. The *προτέλειος θυσία* or *προτέλεια* sc. *ἱερά* was any preliminary or initiatory sacrifice (from *πρὸ* & *τέλος*), generally offered before the commencement of some solemn act or ceremony, such as marriage, &c., for the purpose of conciliating the favor of some divinity for prosperous success. Hence more generally "any conciliatory or propitiating sacrifice" (Cf. Photius, sub voce): "To be to spouse-avenging strifes an aid, the armament's atoning sacrifice."

V. 228–230. The word *κληδών* is here equivalent to *κλῆσις*, the act of calling, naming; hence *κληδόνας πατρώους*, *voces patrem invocantes*, the cries addressed to her father, the invocations of her father.—*αἰῶνα παρθένειόν τ'* may either mean: "and her tender age," or "else, the life of the virgin, the maiden's life."—*παρ' οὐδὲν . . . . ἔθεντο*, "made of no account, heeded not."—*βραβῆς*, the Attic nom. pl. of *βραβεύς* "umpire, arbiter, chief."

V. 231–234. Hesychius makes *ἀόζοι*=*μάγειροι*, *ὑπηρέται*, *θεράποντες*; here, therefore, the sacrificial servants, assistants or attendants of the priests.—*μετ' εὐχάν*, nach Götteranruf, after having invoked the Gods.—*δίκαν* (Dorice=*δίκην*) *χιμαίρας*, "after the manner of, like a kid," i. e., as they were wont to do when sacrificing a kid. The accusative of this passage comes under the category of that of the "*remote* or *intended* effect, i. e., it involves the notion of a tendency towards itself as the aim or end of the action denoted by the predicate. The *manner* of doing a thing is made, as it were,

the goal of the doing itself. Hence the absence of prepositions in such expressions as *τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, hunc in modum, ὅμοια, in like manner, δέμας, instar, ἐπιτηδές, consulto*, &c., as also in *ἀναγκάζειν τινά τι* and *χρῆσθαι τινί τι*. Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 549.

περιπετῆ=περιεσκεπασμένην (Schol.), literally "enveloped or shrouded in something that falls (in folds), or is thrown around one"; "umflattert vom Gewand" (Voss), i. e., "enveloped in her garment's fluttering folds."

παντὶ θυμῷ, forte animo, audacter, German "rüstig"; or it may=*ὅλῃ δυνάμει* (Suidas), "with all their might," *omnibus viribus*. This expression is usually and most naturally referred to the sacrificial attendants and connected with *λαβεῖν*. Voss, however, renders it in conjunction with *προνωπῆ*, "*wie sehr sie räng' hinabwärts*," however much she might struggle downward, i. e., to escape their grasp.

προνωπής=pronus, praeceps, bent forward, head foremost, precipitate. The epithet seems here to imply the idea of precipitation and violence, with which the act was performed, and of which the peculiar attitude was only the *result*. Hence Humboldt translates it with *λαβεῖν*, "forwärts schwingen," i. e., to hurry or swing onward; and Schneider remarks: *προνωπῆ* is proleptical for *ὥστε προνωπῆ γενέσθαι*. But there is another prolepsis in *λαβεῖν ἀέρδην*, as we do not say "to seize aloft," but "to seize for the purpose of raising aloft," or "to seize and raise aloft." It is thus, that the poet with his peculiar conciseness presents to us a complete picture of every stage of the terrific act.—The father commands the ministers of sacrifice courageously to seize, precipitate along and raise aloft upon the altar, as they were wont to raise the sacrificial kid, the maid enveloped in her garment's fluttering folds. The fact that the intended victim of the sacrificial knife was a human one, and besides the cherished daughter of the chief commander himself; moreover, the presence of the reluctantly, sorrow-stricken parent on the spot, would naturally produce a feeling of timid hesitation in the minds of those charged with the performance of the rite; hence the motive for the

poet's introduction of the words *παντὶ θυμῷ*, in the sense we have given them above.

V. 236–237. *στόματός τε καλλιπρώρου*, i. e., *στομ· καλῆς πρώρας*. Concerning the expression *φυλακὰν κατασχεῖν* there are several opinions. Schütz makes *φυλακάν*=*φύλακας* and the subject of the infinitive: *eosque* (*tanquam*) *custodes oris formosi vocem . . . . . comprimere.* In like manner Schneider has: *dass Verwahrung hemme* i. e., that a preventing care or guard might check. But *φυλακὰν κατασχεῖν* must, like the well known *φυλακὴν ἔχειν* of Herodotus, here be regarded as one phrase, equivalent to *φυλάττεσθαι* or rather *φυλάττειν*, to have a care, a watchful eye upon, to guard, check, prevent. The expression then depends, like *λαβεῖν*, on the principal verb of the sentence (on *φράσεν*, of v. 231,) and has *φθόγγον* for its object, in other words, *φθόγγον* is the immediate object of the verbal action still inherent in the substantive *φυλακάν*. Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 553, Anm. 5.

ἀραῖον, curse-laden, calamitous, of direful import to the royal house. So Sophocles in Medea, v. 608, *σοῖς ἀραία γ' οὖσα τυγχάνω δόμοις*. "Cavere volebat Agamemnon, ne Iphigeniae forte dirae aut imprecationes exciderent, quae damnum essent generi suo illaturae." Schütz.

V. 238. *βίᾳ χαλινῶν τ' ἀναύδῳ μένει*, by violence and speechless (i. e., speech-preventing) force of bridle. These words are undoubtedly to be referred to the preceding sentence, as descriptive of the means, by which she was to be prevented from giving utterance to an imprecation on the royal house, or to any sound portentous of evil to those around. Thus Schütz, Humboldt, Voss, and others. But Schneider and Haupt, unwilling to suffer the new strophe to begin with the part of an unfinished sentence, connect the verse with what follows, thus making the dative expressive of the cause or reason of, her casting the pitiful glance at her immolators: "owing to, by reason of the violence done to her person and the speech-stifling force of the gag, &c."

χαλινῶν, "*frenorum*, h. e., vittarum seu veli, quo obvolvi jussit os filiae, ne ejularet." Blomfield.

V. 239. *χρόκου βαφάς, the safron's dye or tint.* What this dye or tint was or had reference to, the poet himself gives us no further information. Humboldt takes the same poetic liberty in an equally indefinite rendering of the line: "*des Safran's Tünchung zu Boden giessend*, i. e., pouring the safron's dye upon the ground." The most obvious inference would be that this was the blood of Iphigenia, to which moreover the very same epithet is applied in verse 1092, *ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἔδραμε χροκοβαφὴς στάγων.* So Schneider and others. Schütz, however, cites Pers. 660 *χροκόβαπτον ποδὸς εὔμαριν* and the *χρόκεον εἷμα* of Pindar, and adds: "*χρόκου βαφαί* sunt velamenta croco tincta. Hoc loco autem *vittae* seu *infulae* intelliguntur, Iphigeniae, ut hostiae, more solenni impositae." This opinion of Schütz is adopted by Bothe, Voss, Haupt and others, all of whom render: "dropping her safron-tinted fillets, veil or robe." To establish the legitimacy of the peculiar use of *χέουσα*, which ordinarily designates the pouring of liquids alone, the Homeric *κατέχευεν πέπλον* of Iliad V. 734 is quoted. As regards the use of the word *βαφή*, its well established and ordinary significations are: 1st *the act of dipping*, e. g., either red hot iron into the water for the purpose of tempering it, or stuffs into colouring matter; hence 2dly *the act or process of coloring or dyeing;* and 3dly the *coloring matter or dye itself.* But of its ever being used to designate the *material* or *stuff* thus coloured or dyed, we have no example. The words of this sentence, therefore, taken each in its ordinary and legitimate signification, are decidedly in favor of the first rendering, and as the shedding of the victim's blood is a more indispensable concomitant of the sacrificial rite, than the dropping of the robe or fillets, (which by the way could scarcely have reached the ground from the altar), we see no reason whatever for adopting the second. It was after she had already been struck with the knife and when her safron-tinted blood was already flowing, that she yet smote each of her immolators with a pity-wooing shaft from her eye, mute and lovely like a painted martyr-saint of later times. (In the whole of this

description the poet seems to proceed upon the supposition of the actual immolation of the princess, and to be unacquainted with, or to ignore, the well known fable of a miraculous substitution.)

V. 241–244. *πρεπουσά θ' ὡς ἐν γραφαῖς, spectanda ut in tabulis.* To this the Scholiast correctly adds *διὰ τὸ κάλλος ἢ διὰ τὸ ἀφωνητεῖν.* "Muta erat Iphigenia, eademque venusta, atque adeo pictae similis." Blomfield. So the Germans say: "*bildschön,*" "*wie gemalt,*" i. e., artistically beautiful, charming like a picture; "reizend als im Kunstgemälde" (Voss), and Euripides Hecuba v. 564 has *στέρνα, ὡς ἀγάλματος, κάλλιστα.* Whether the poet here makes any allusion to actual works of art commemorative of this event, and existing in his time at Athens, is a matter of uncertainty, though not impossible.

προσεννέπειν θέλουσ', haud secus ac si principes sacrificantes alloqui vellet, quod tamen ei non licebat.—*ἐπεὶ πολλάκις πατρός, κ. τ. λ.* "hoc ideo additur, ut appareat, quo modo Iphigenia familiariter adspicere principes Graecorum, quasi allocutura, potuerit: non ignotos enim compellasset, cum saepe in patris coeniculis opiparis post coenam, ad quam illi duces invitati essent, patris jussu cantasset." Schütz. The object of *προσεννέπειν* is here again left indefinite and to be inferred from what proceeds. There is, moreover, manifestly an ellipsis in the sentence, which must be supplied in order to give *ἐπεί* its proper force: desiring (once more) to address (sc., the chieftain-friends of her royal sire), as often she had done before, when in her father's sumptuously furnished banquet-halls, she had delighted them with songs.

ἔμελψεν is the reading of the Glasgow edition, of Schütz, Blomfield and others, instead of the older and unintelligible *ἔμελθεν* and *ἔμελλεν.* This Hermann has again unnecessarily emended into *ἔμιχθεν,* which led Humboldt into the error of translating: "Verlangend noch, wie sonst, nach Anrede, weil sie oft im Männergemach des Vaters versammelt einst weilten."

V. 244–246. *ἀγνὰ δ' . . . . ἑτίμα.* The *δέ* is here again

equivalent to *γάρ*. Cf. Note to v. 185.—*ἀγνά* is the common and most ancient lection, which Schütz and Blomfield after him have corrupted into *ἀγνᾷ*, in order to make it agree with *αὐδᾷ*. This is entirely inexcusable. The nominative by far preferable; and of the two adjectives *ἀγνα ἀταύρωτος* we may either take one substantively, as Schneider suggests, or both may be regarded as synonymous epithets belonging to the subject, ("*she*," or "the maiden") to be supplied from the context. Nor is there any need of changing the universally adopted *αὐδᾷ*, "with her voice," into *Ἀιδᾳ*, "by her death," as Hermann would have it, who (together with Humboldt) misapprehends the meaning of the sentence altogether, by referring it to a willingness on the part of Iphigenia to die for the purpose of winning glory for her father under the walls of Troy, when it manifestly is nothing more than an expansion of the previous lines, by which the poet intends to account for her frequent singing in the paternal halls. The cause of this was, as he imforms us, nothing more or less than her fondness for celebrating with her voice the happy lot of her beloved father, whose life was one of perpetual merriment and regal splendor.

ἀταύρωτος, *viri expers*, *ἄζευκτος*, *πάρθενεική* (Schol.), the unmarried one, spotless virgin.—*τριτόσπονδον· πολλὰς θυσίας ποιοῦντα καὶ εὐωχίας καὶ συμπόσια* (Scholiast). The word strictly signifies: "having, affording, or abounding in, the third libation," which it was customary to pour to Jupiter *Σωτήρ* at banquets and other convivial entertainments. The life, therefore, that could at any time afford a third libation might from the stand-point of the ancients be called a *blessed* one, either (as the Scholiast indicates) from the material consideration of its abounding in banquets and symposia, which even philosophers regarded as one of the causes of felicitation, or else because such a life was under the immediate protection of Jupiter *Σωτήρ*, to whom that libation, under the name of *τρίτος κρατήρ*, was dedicated, and after which he himself was called *Ζεὺς σωτήρ τρίτος*, Suppl. v. 27. Blomfield shows by a quotation from

Antiphanes, that during this libation it was customary to have a paean sung, and it was perhaps this consideration that induced Haupt to render *τριτόσπονδον* by: *dum tertia fiebat libatio*, not without considerable plausibility.

φίλως ἐτίμα, "she was wont to celebrate with alacrity, she loved to celebrate, was fond of doing so."

V. 247. *τὰ δ' ἔνθεν*, "interpretor, *quae inde secutura sint*, (ut saepe apud Aristotelem *τὰ ἐντεῦθεν* sunt, quae inde sequuntur) ut his verbis contineatur suspicio quaedam de Agamemnonis fortuna." *The consequences of this act* (with reference to the fate of Agamemnon, namely) *I neither know nor venture to relate.*" This is most probably the meaning. It may, however, also be rendered: *quae secuta sunt seu quae inde facta, neque vidi neque dico*, with reference to the further particulars of the sacrifice. These the chorus neither saw nor was willing to relate, either because they were out of place here, or as the Scholiast suggests *διὰ τὸ ἀπάνθρωπον εἶναι τὴν σφαγήν*. A graphic description is furnished by Euripides Iphig. Aulica v. 1390, seqq, and another by Lucretius De Rer. Natura, Lib. I. v. 84.

V. 249. *δίκα δὲ . . . . τὸ μέλλον*. This passages has been interpreted in various ways: "Justitia autem iis, qui mala perpessi sunt, seram ex damno sapientiam appendit." Schütz. "Justitia illis, qui mala passi sunt, futura adducit, ut cognoscant." Wellauer. "Justitia illis, qui mala perpessi sunt, hoc tribuit, ut inde discant." Blomfield. "Auch Dike wägt traun den Leiderduldenden Belehrung zu für künftig," i. e., "and Diké too deals surely out to those who suffer, instruction for the future." Voss.—*τοῖς μὲν πεπονθόσι ἡ δίκη δίδωσι τὸ μαθεῖν. Δίκην γὰρ δόντες μανθάνουσι τὸ μέλλον*. Scholiast. We omit many others that are even less in accordance with the context. If we examine the passage closely, it will appear that *τὸ μέλλον* must here necessarily be taken as the object of *ἐπιῤῥέπει*. It signifies either the *future generally*, or else *the allotments of the future, future destiny* as ordained by Jove; and this is the sense in which the Scholiast seems to have regarded the word, when in v. 245 he explains it by adding: *τὸ πεπρωμένον*

φανερὸν ἥξει. It is likewise evident from the position of μαθεῖν, that it is grammatically dependent on παθοῦσεν, and that it here may be considered as =ὥστε μαθεῖν. This construction will give us a sense in perfect harmony with what precedes, and the transition to what follows will likewise be natural and easy. The chorus then wishes to say: "The consequences of this act, however, I have not yet lived to witness, nor do I pretend to say what they will be." At all events, the prophecies of Kalchas will not be unfulfilled, and Dikè will mete out (ἐπιῤῥέπει for the fut. ἐπιῤῥέψει, lit. "will weigh out") with even hand their future lot to them (i. e., to the immolators of Iphigenia and to Agamemnon especially) at least, who suffer to learn wisdom (whom sad experience is to teach what's right). But to foreknow this (future lot), and what its end will be (ἥ λύσις), I bid farewell to that (let that go to the Deuce!); 't were equal to the lamenting it beforehand."

As a grammatical peculiarity of the passage, the μέν *solitarium* after the demonstrative τοῖς deserves to be noticed. The adversative δέ, which ordinarily follows μέν as its correlative, is here omitted, or rather the entire adversative clause, to which δέ would belong, is suppressed and must be mentally supplied. Hence τοῖς becomes emphatic by its connection with μέν: *to them at least* Dikè will weigh out, etc. Whether it will do so to the others, I am not sure, or: to others perhaps not. Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 734, 2.

V. 251. This verse has been one of the most corrupt and difficult passages in the entire choral ode. The text of the different Mss. varies enormously and savors of interpolations. In the Farnesian Codex, one of the oldest and most important, the words τὸ δὲ προκλύειν are entirely wanting, which led Elmsley and Blomfield to the hasty conclusion that they were to be rejected as a gloss. Hence Blomfield connects τὸ μέλλον δ' ἐπεὶ οὐ γένοιτ' ἄν λύσις προχαιρέτο, without, however, giving any satisfactory explanation of the sense he intended to convey. Nay, his "*futura vero scisciari, quandoquidem horum nullum est effugium, valeat!*" is a contradiction of his own text, in which he has rejected the

very word (*προκλύειν*) that still forms a part of his translation. The difficulty, therefore, does not lie in *τὸ προκλύειν*, which is not only found in all the Mss., except in the one, mentioned above, (where its omission may be regarded as accidental,) but is absolutely indispensable to make any sense whatever of the passage. But the words that intervened between *τὸ προκλύειν* and *προχαιρέτω* were so corrupt as to be entirely unintelligible. They are: *ἐπιγένοιτ' ἄν κλύοις* (or *ἀνκλύοις*); in others *ἐπεὶ γένοιτ' ἄν ἡ λύσις*. I omit mentioning the conjectures and emendations of the various editors. The most common was: *τὸ δὲ προκλύειν, ἐπεὶ γένοιτ' ἄν ἤλυσις, προχαιρέτω*. It was Hermann who in his note to Humboldt's translation first proposed to reject *ἐπεὶ γένοιτ'* altogether as an interpolation, and to read *τὸ προκλύειν δ' ἤλυσιν προχαιρέτω, voraus das Ende zu vernehmen sei wir fern!* (Humboldt) "Far be it from me to learn the end beforehand!" and in his late edition (i. e. his posthumous Aeschylus) he still retains this reading. Bothe and Schneider both agree with Hermann in regarding the *ἐπεὶ γένοιτ'* as hurtful to sense and reason both; but they retain the *λύσις* of the Mss., not without propriety. Schneider has: *τὸ δὲ προκλύειν ἢ λύσις προχαιρέτω*, "to learn this (i. e. future destiny) before the solution (of the plot), farewell to that!"—The *ἤ* in this reading denotes a comparison of time in connection with the *πρό* of the verb *προκλύειν*, and is equivalent to the more common *πρόσθεν ἤ* or *πρὶν ἤ sooner than, before*. Bothe, finally, reads *τὸ δὲ προκλύειν, ἦ λύσις, προχαιρέτω, praescire autem quae sit solutio*, i. e. finis harum rerum, *valeto*!—an emendation which not only offers us the simplest grammatical construction, but approximates more closely than any other to the original form of these obscure words as they are presented by the Mss. It is on this account, that I am inclined to give it a place in the text in preference to Hermann's. The *λύσις*=the *solution*, as it were of this intricate problem, the *dénouement*, as the French would say, of these events, the *end* of these things.

V. 252. *τῷ προστένειν· ὁ γὰρ προγινώσκων τὸ μέλλον(=πεπρωμένον) καὶ προστενάζει.* Scholiast.—*ἴσον* may either be ta-

ken adverbially (=ἴσως or ἴσα), as it often occurs in Homer and in all the Attic writers, with the dative, in the sense of "like, as well as": "Farewell to that, i. e., the foreknowledge of the future, as well as (and likewise) to premature lamenting." Thus Schneider. Or perhaps better, ἴσον is here an adjective, δέ=γάρ, and the clause assigns the cause or reason for the preceding προχαιρέτω: *tandundem enim esset gemituum anticipatio.* The verb προστένειν in the sense of "lamenting, groaning beforehand or prematurely," occurs in Prometh. v. 695 (Ed. Tauchnitz): πρόγε στενάζεις, καὶ φόβου πλέα τὶς εἶ.

V. 253. τορόν =φανερόν, *clare*: τὸ πεπρωμένον φανερὸν ἥξει. (Schol.). This passage has been hideously mutilated by the commentators. Schütz corrupts it into ξύναρθρον αἴτιας, *clare enim omnia evenient noxis convenientia*, quod ad noxam Agamemnonis ex immolatione filiae contractam pertineret." Hermann conjectures αὐγαῖς for ἀὐταις, in accordance with which Humboldt renders: "*Und sicher kommt es dem Tag entsprechend*, i. e. and surely it will come, coïnciding with the day," i. e. on the very day (of its prediction). Wellauer reads σύνορθρον αὐγαῖς, *simul cum matutinis diei radiis.* Blomfield after Guelf. Ald. Rob. Turn. and Stanley: σύναρθρον αὐταῖς, referring αὐταῖς to the predictions of Kalchas, the τέγναι of v. 248. This reference, however, is far too remote. I prefer to adopt the σύναρθρον ἀὐταῖς of Flor. and Farn., which the glossa to Farn. correctly explains by συνηρμοσμένον βοαῖς καὶ θρήνοις.—σύναρθρον, better than the unintelligible σύνορθρον—*connexum, consonum, congruens:* "metaphora ab ossium junctura sumpta" (Blomf.). "For it, i. e. the dark lot of the future, will come distinctly (will manifest itself clearly), accompanied by sounds of wail (zusammenstimmend mit Klagetönen—Schneider)." The chorus therefore means to say, that he desires not to learn beforehand and prematurely the precise nature or the details of the πεπρωμένον of Agamemnon. Of one general fact, however, he feels assured, which is, that it will be a mournful fate, and that its arrival will be distinctly announced by the voices of lamentation and distress with which it will be attended.

V. 255. *τἀπι τούτοισεν*: either "after these events, subsequently, thereafter, quod futura attinet," or else "besides, after all, in other respects."—*εὔπραξις*=*εὐπραξία* (Scholiast), or according to Photius the *εὐπραγία* of the later Greeks: *secundus rerum exitus.* The propriety of the use of this word has been questioned by Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 501, and Schneider too suggests the substitution of *εὖ πρᾶξις.* "Sed *εὔπραξις* defensum est in Parisina editione Thesauri Stephani in v. *εὐθεράπευσις.*" Hermann.—The chorus here simply expresses the hope, that Agamemnon, after having suffered the inevitable consequences of this deed, might yet be happy and prosperous. "May then at least thereafter be prosperity, or may then at least in other respects the lot of Agamemnon and his house be still a happy one." We have here to supply a dative of the remote subject: "May there be," (sc. to Agamemnon), &c., i. e. "may he have," &c.

V. 255–257. *ὡς . . . . ἔρκος.* Many of the older commentators, and among the more recent Blomfield and Bothe have fallen into the egregious error of applying this language to the old men of the chorus: "Senes de semet ipsis loquuntur," says Blomfield. The prologue of the Persae is cited in support of this opinion, and, sure enough, the Scholiast gives likewise as an explanation of the words *μονόφρουρον ἔρκος· ἐπειδὴ μόνοι γέροντες ἐφύλασσον τὴν Ἑλλάδα.* Hinc illae lacrymae! But no one will pretend to claim infallibility for the Scholiast, who certainly is mistaken here. The chorus is composed of subjects, to whom no power could have been delegated by their absent master, and who, at all events, could never have been guilty of the stolidity of using such unbecoming, boastful language in the presence of their advancing queen; to say nothing of the inconsistency of the poet in making the same old men, who in v. 82 complain of the utter imbecility and helplessness of age (calling themselves but an *ὄναρ ἡμερόφαντον*), appear here in v. 246 at once transferred into the *μονόφρουρον ἔρκος* of the state! Klytemnestra was the sole representative of the royal power in the absence of her husband, as the next

following verses conclusively show, and to her alone the epithets of this sentence can with any sort of propriety be applied.—*ἄγχιστον* is by the Scholiast correctly made= *συγγενικόν*, *cognatum*, the "nearest relative" of Agamemnon, not *proximum* in a local sense, much less *Argis natum* or *Argivum*, as those who apply this passage to the chorus would have it. Thus Herodotus V. 79 has *οἱ ἄγχιστα* in the same sense, and Euripides Troad. V. 48 *τὸν γένει ἄγχιστον πατρός*. The *locality* of the approaching queen is already sufficiently pointed out by the demonstrative *τόδ'*: As most earnestly desires that (yonder) nearest relative of his (i. e. of Agammenon), sole-watching bulwark of the Apian land."

The *Ἀπία γαῖη* of Aeschylus, also called *Ἀπία* simply, is a name of the Peloponnesos, and more particularly of Argolis, and is derived from *Ἄπις*, an ancient fabulous king of that region. This must carefully be distinguished from the *ἀπία γαῖη* of Homer, Il. I, 270; Odyss. VII, 25, and id. XVI, 18, which, as Buttmann (Lexilogos Vol. I p. 67), has shown, is derived from the preposition *ἀπό*, and signifies "the distant land." So does the *τὴν ἀπίαν γᾶν* of Sophocl. Oed. Col. v. 1668 (ed. Wunder), where the Scholiast correctly explains by *τὴν μακρὰν καὶ ἄπωθεν οὖσαν*. But there is not only a difference of origin, but also a difference of quantity in these words, the Alpha of *Ἀπία* being long, whilst that of *ἀπίη* is short. Blomfield in his note to this passage not only confounds the proper name and the general term, but the very passages, which he cites, all go to prove the opposite of his assertion. The remark of the Schol. Ven. would be correct, if applied to our passage or to Soph. Oed. Col. 1298, but to Il. I, 270, or to any other place in Homer, where *ἀπίη* occurs, it is a blunder, such as Scholiasts have often made. So it would be to Oed. Col. 1668, quoted above. In opposition to the Schol. Ven. I advance Hesychius to Odyss. VII, 25, who interprets the *τηλόθεν ἐξ ἀπίης γαίης* by *ἀλλοτρίας, ἢ ξένης, ἢ μακρὰν οὔσης*. Just so Strabo, p. 371; and Eustathius to Iliad III defines: *Ἀπία δὲ γῆ κἀνταῦθα, ὡς ἐν τῇ ἀραψῳδίᾳ ἡ ἀποαφεστῶσα, καὶ ἀλλοπαδή, καὶ ὡς ἄν εἴποι τις Ὁμηρεικὸς τηλοῦ ἀπὸ*

Τροίας· κατὰ δὲ ἄλλους φάναι ποιητής, ἡ τηλουρός. οἱ μὲν νεώτεροι τὴν Πελοπόννησόν φασιν ἀπό τινος Ἄπιδος ἢ Ἄπεως. With respect to the proper name "Apis," its origin and quantity, Hermann ad. Oed. Col. 1298 (ed. Wunder) remarks: "Rex fuerat Peloponnesi, a quo tota Peloponnesus nomen Apiae terrae accepit. Ex iis quae de eo rege Aeschylus Suppl. 260 seqq. (ed. Tauchnitz) refert, intelligitur nomen illud *τὸν ἤπιον* ("the kind, gentle one") significare, fabulamque illam ad vitae humarioris cultum in illis locis introductum spectare. Simul apparet magis cum ea nominis derivatione productionem primae syllabae adjectivi *Ἄπιος*, quae tragicis usitata est, quam correptionem, quae Epicis placuit, convenire."

V. 258. To this and the five subsequent verses we find *ἄγγελος* prefixed in the codices Guelf. Bess. Flor. and by the *secunda manu* of Cod. Medic.; the same in the printed editions Ald. Turn. Vict.—The Codex Farn. has *ἄγγελος φύλαξ*, and Robertellus *φύλαξ* simply. "Ineptissime!" says Schütz correctly, who adopts Stanley's substitution of the name of the chorus. But this even is unnecessary. These verses are so closely linked to the conclusion of the ode, that it would be absurd to attribute them to any one but to the chorus. Roused from his melancholy musings on the probable destiny of the royal house by the approach of the queen, and mindful of the duties of loyalty, he respectfully advances to meet her, saluting her with his *ἥκω σεβίζων σὸν κράτος*! "With reverence I approach your majesty!" The change of measure from the intricate windings of the strophe to the precise and stately marching matter of-fact Iambics of the dialogue is in keeping with the change of subjects and has an admirable effect. It is this transition undoubtedly, that misled the copyists and earlier editors, who saw not its necessity, into the absurd error of attributing these verses to another personage.

V. 259. The word *ἀρχηγός* (also *ἀρχηγέτης*, from *ἀρχή* & *ἡγέομαι*) commonly signifies "author, originator, founder, progenitor," &c. So Epist. ad Heb. c. 2, v. 10 *τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας*; here, however, it is "leader, chief, sovereign,"

as in Eurip. Iphig. Taur. 1304 *ἀρχηγὸς χθονός*, and Troad. 1258 *ἀρχηγοὶ στρατοῦ*. Cf. Blomf. Gloss. p. 250.

V. 260. The term *ἄρσενος* may either be taken as an adjective agreeing with *θρόνου*, *orbato virili solio*, "wenn verwaiset steht der Männerthron" (Humboldt), or perhaps better as a substantive governed by *ἐρημωθέντος*, *throno a viro vacuo relicto*. So Eurip. Hec. 883 *πῶς γυναιξὶν ἀρσένων ἔσται κράτος*, and id. v. 1017 *ἀρσένων ἐρημία*. Klausen infers from Odyss. VI, 303, seqq., that both the king and the queen had each a separate throne, and then the vacancy here expressed would apply to one of them only: "the male, (.i e., husband's) throne." But the fact in question is not sufficiently established, and the correctness of such an inference from the above passage of the Odyssey may justly be questioned. The Scholiast too assumes one throne only. His remark to *ἐρημωθέντος* is: *ἤγουν ἐρήμου καταλειφθέντος, ὡς ἀποδημοῦντος τοῦ βασιλέως· παρόντος μέντοι οὐ δεῖ συντυγχάνειν αὐτῇ*. To this may be added, that *θρόνος* in Homer does not necessarily mean a "seat of power or throne" in the present acceptation of the term, but more generally a "chair, arm-chair, fauteuil"; its restricted signification is post-homeric.

V. 261. *εἴ τι κεδνόν* is the conjecture of Auratus, adopted by Blomfield, and likewise preferred by Hermann to the more common *εἴτε κεδνόν*. The latter is found in all the Mss., except in the Medicean (the best), where, as Hermann remarks, the last letter of *εἴτε* is an "*ε*" *e correctione*. In defense of the *εἴ τι* Hermann says: "Est id aptius, licet defendi possit *εἴτε*;" and Blomfield: "Sensus non est, sive audisti sive non, sed potius, Lubens discam num audieris necne."—The word *κεδνός*, when said of news, is the opposite of *κακός*, and="favorable, lucky, good." Thus Blomf. and Passow. But its primary signification is "careful, discreet, reliable, faithful;" and in a passive sense generally "that on which care is expended (from *κήδομαι*), dear, venerable, respected"; hence, when said of intelligence, it may mean "carefully ascertained, sure, reliable." This is the sense, in which Humboldt takes it, and probably the true one here.

In v. 262 *πῶς δῆτ' ἄν εἰπὼν κεδνὰ τἀληθῆ τύχοις*, it appears to be the same, but in v. 648 it is opposed to *κακός*.—That the participle *πεπυσμένη* has here an active or rather middle sense, it is scarcely necessary to remark, it being a general rule of Greek Grammar, that the form of the perf. and pluperf. passive, as well as that of the present and imperf., is identical with the same tenses of the middle. Cf. Rost's Greek Gramm. p. 568.

V. 262. *εὐαγγέλοισιν ἐλπίσιν* may either be: "with hopes excited by good news, or with hopes that are the messengers of good tidings," "spes quae bona nuntiant," as in Euripides Phoen. 1224 *ἐζ εὐαγγέλου φήμης*; or lastly, it may = *εὐαγγελίας ἐλπίσιν*, "in hopes, in expectation of good news," as Eurip. Med. 1010, *δόξης δ' ἐσφάλην εὐαγγέλου*, where Wunder makes *δόξα εὐάγγελος=δόξα ἀγαθῆς ἀγγελίας*. The last rendering (undoubtedly the true one here) is adopted by Schütz, Humboldt and also by Kühner, who (Ausf. Gramm. § 473. Anm.), after citing a number of parallel passages, justly remarks: "This mode of construction sets forth in an ingenious manner the intimate union subsisting between the substantive and its attributive modifications. It is moreover characterized by a certain boldness and elevation of expression, which are truly poetical. Hence its frequent occurrence in Tragical and Lyric poetry, while in Comedy and in Prose (with the single exception of Herodotus) it is rarely found." The passage is elegantly given by Humboldt:

> "Ob sichre Botschaft spähend, oder ungewiss
> Du erst in froher Kunde Hoffnung opferest,
> Vernähm' ich gern."
>
> If certain news descrying, or uncertain yet
> Thou erst in hope of glad despatch dost sacrifice,
> I'd gladly learn.

But why should the queen offer sacrifices, if she was not certain that the news were favorable? To this Stanley replies: "Etiam in re incerta et dubia sacrificabant *εὐαγγέλια*," in proof of which he cites the language of Klytemnestra in v. 578, and the Scholiast's note to Aristoph. Equit.—*ἔθον ἦν τοῖς ἐν ἀγυιαῖς ἱσταμένοις θεοῖς ἐπι ταῖς ἐρχομέναις*

ἀγγελίαις θύειν, ὡς ἂν εἰ ἀγαθαὶ εἶεν, ἐπινεύσαιεν ταύταις, εἰ δὲ τοὐναντίον, ἀποτρέψαιεν." The standing expression for this religious act was εὐαγγέλια θύειν, concerning which cf. Spanheim's note and Kühner's Gramm. § 547, 2. The verb θυηπολεῖν is here equivalent to θύειν, as in Eurip. Electra 665, ἔνθ' θυηπολεῖ θεοῖς, and id. v. 1134 οὗ πόσις θυηπολεῖ Νύμφαισιν.—The adjective εὔφρων may either be *lubens*, I should be glad to hear, or perhaps better *benevolus erga te*, as Blomfield has it, i. e., I your friend, or with friendly intentions, I should like to learn. By the phrase οὐδὲ σιγώσῃ φθόνος, *neque tamen tacenti* (*tibi*) *invidia*, the chorus means to say, that he deferentially submits it to the pleasure of the queen, either to communicate the intelligence in her possession, or to keep it to herself, as she had a right to do. Hence the Scholiast correctly: εἰ μὴ θέλεις εἰπεῖν, οὐ μεμψαίμην ἄν.

V. 264–265. παροιμία· παλαιὸς λόγος, Schol. The ancient proverb seems to have been γένοιτο καλὴ ἡμέρα, ὥσπερ ἡ νύξ, as would appear from the Scholiast. This originated in the general opinion of the Ancients, that night was the mother of day. So Hesiod Theog. 123, ἐκ Χάεος δ' Ἔρεβός τε μέλαινά τε Νὺξ ἐγένοντο, Νυκτὸς δ' αὖτ' Αἰθήρ τε καὶ Ἡμέρη ἐξεγένοντο; and Thales in reply to the inquiry, which was first in the order of origination, night or day, is reported to have said: "Night is older by one day." The term εὐφρόνη, lit. "the propitious, kindly, friendly one," is euphemistic, and particularly frequent in the later poets, instead of νύξ, with which the Greeks associated the idea of darkness and of terror. To this cosmological conception in regard to the precedence of night may perhaps be referred the custom of the Atheneans to compute the commencement of their day from the eve or sun-set of the preceding (Aul. Gell. iii, 2.), a custom, which seems to have been pretty generally prevalent among Barbarous nations even. So Caesar with reference to the Gauls (Lib. vi, c. 18) remarks: "Dies natales, et mensium et annorum initia sic observant, ut noctem dies subsequatur;" and Tacitus of the Germans (Germ. c. 11.): "Nec dierum numeros, ut nos,

sed noctium computant." Cf. Blomfield. In the Germanic mythology we likewise find a myth similar to that of the Greeks. According to the Edda, *Nôtt*, the daughter of Noervi the *joetunn* (i. e. the giant), black and swarthy, like all her race, bore to Dellîngr, the last of her husband's and of Odin's race, a son *Dâgr*, of light complexion and fair, like all his paternal progenitors. Cf. Grimm Deutsche Mythol. c. 16.

The optative *γένοιτο* may here either be regarded as expressive of a wish, in the sense *εἴθε* (*εἰ γὰρ*) *γένοιτο*! "An harbinger of gladness may this morning's light be born of mother night, as saith the ancient saw!" Or it may be made=*γένοιτ' ἄν*, to denote an indefinite possibility, and then the passage would read: "The rosy morn, as goes the saw, may indeed (*μέν*) become (as it generally does,) a messenger of joy from kindly mother night, but this time you will learn (*πεύσει δὲ*)" &c., &c. This construction has the advantage of admitting the usual antithetical force of *μέν* and *δέ*, and the comparison thus instituted between the blessings, which morning ordinarily and of itself brings, and the preëminently joyful news, which this particular morning is expected to announce, adds greatly to the exaltation of the latter. Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 466, *b*; and § 467, 2.

V. 266. The construction *μεῖζον ἐλπίδος κλύειν* deserves to be noticed more particularly. In the first place, we have here a peculiar form of comparison, of which the second member is not, as is ordinarily the case, a simple term, like the first, but of a complex nature, containing an entire sentence compressed in one substantive, which, as usually, is put in the genitive after the comparative. Thus Herodotus says of the Pyramids, that they are *λόγου μέζονες* i. e., *grandiores quam ut oratione explicari possit*, when he might equally correctly say (*ἦσαν . . . . αἱ πυραμίδες*) *μέζονες, ἢ λέξαι λόγῳ*. So Eurip. Suppl. 854 has *χρείσσον', ἢ λέξαι λόγῳ, τολμήμαθ'*, and Hec. 1089 *χρείσσον', ἢ φέρειν, κακά, graviora quam quae ferri possint*; or with the opt. and *ὡς*:

μέζονες, ἢ ὡς τῷ λόγῳ τις ἂν εἴποι. In the same way Sophoc. Oed. T. 1339 has *ἐμοὶ ἔργ' ἐστὶ κρείσσον' ἀγχόνης εἰργασμένα, atrociora admisi scelera, quam quae suspendio lui possint*, as Brunck correctly explains, and in v. 1349 of this play our poet has again *ὕψος κρεῖσσον ἐκπηδήματος, altitudine majus quam quod transiliri queat.* Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 751. The second point is that *κλύειν* is dependent, not on *μεῖζον*, but on *ἐλπίδος*, or rather on the complex verbal notion involved in it. The infinitive after abstract substantives denoting an affection of the mind, is a common construction in Greek, but the substantive ordinarily stands in connection with *εἶναι* or *γίγνεσθαι*, so as to form one verbal expression with it, e. g. Eurip. Orest. 770 *μολόντι δ' ἐλπὶς ἐστι σωθῆναι κακῶν*; and Alcest. 304 *οὔτις ἐλπὶς ἦν* (sc. *μοι*) *ἄλλα φυτύσειν τέκνα.* Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 641, c.—The entire expression *μεῖζον ἐλπίδος κλύειν* would therefore be = *μεῖζον, ἢ σοι ἐλπὶς ἐστι, κλύειν*, or *μεῖζον, ἢ ὥστ' ἂν ἐλπίσαις κλύειν*, "greater than (is your) hope to hear, greater than you could expect to hear."

V. 268. *πῶς φῄς*; *Quid ais?* "Formula diffidentis et re improvisa perculsi." Cf. Eurip. Hel. 471 *πῶς φῄς*; *τίν' εἶπας μῦθον*; *αὖθίς μοι φράσον*! and Phoen. 915 *τί φῄς, τίν' εἶπας τόνδε μῦθον, ὦ γέρον*; So also Aeschyl. Choëph. 714 *ὅπως*; *λέγ' αὖθις, ὡς μάθω σαφέστερον*! where Valckenaer proposes to put the more usual *πῶς φῄς* in place of the *ἢ πῶς*; *τί πῶς*; and *ὅπως* of the different editions.

ἐξ ἀπιστίας, prae incredulitate, i. e. what you have said just now is so incredible, that I no longer know what you really did say: "Adeo incredibilia sunt, quae narras, ut audita audivisse mihi non videar." Schütz.—The preposition *ἐξ* may here denote the *reason, consequence*, and *ἀπιστίας* may be taken in a passive sense: *incredibility.*

V. 269. To *Τροίαν 'Αχαιῶν οὖσαν* we supply *φημί* from the preceding verse. The verba declarandi *λέγω, φράζω, φημί*, &c., are commonly construed with the infinitive, and with the participle only by way of exception. Hence *οὖσαν* = *εἶναι.* Kühner's Gramm. § 658, Anm. 3, b.

V. 270. *χαρά μ' ὑφέρπει, κ. τ. λ.* Tears as the result of

sudden joy are often mentioned by the Greek poets, as, e. g. below, v. 527, and v. 573; Sophoc. Elect. 1212 *γεγηθὸς ἕρπει δάκρυον ὀμμάτων ἄπο*; id 889 and 1294; Homer Odyss. xix. 471 *τὴν δ' ἅμα χάρμα καὶ ἄλγος ἕλε φρένα*, where Eustathius incorrectly attributes this verse of Aeschylus to Sophocles. The much admired *δακρυόεν γελάσασα* of Iliad VI. 484, and the *κλαυσίγελως* of Xenophon are likewise in place here.

V. 271. The sentence to which *γάρ* serves as an explanation is here, as often, omitted, and to be inferred from the context: *yes I see, for*, &c. Kühner's Grammat, § 754.

κατηγορεῖν is not the logical *praedicare, attribuere*, as Casaubon and Spanheim would have it here, but its ordinary signification "to accuse, argue," taken in a good sense is preferable. In the same manner we use the English word to *betray*, i. e., *to indicate*. So Sept. adv. Theb. 406 *ἡ γλῶσσ' ἀληθὴς γίγνεται κατήγορος* and Soph. Ajax 885, when in reply to the enquiry, by whose hand Ajax had fallen, Tekmessa says: "By his own, it's evident," and adds as proof *ἐν γάρ οἱ χθονὶ πηκτὸν τόδ' ἔγχος περιπετὲς κατηγορεῖ*. The verb taken in this sense, comes under the category of those verbs, the activity of which gives rise to an immediate (sensuous or intellectual) perception, and which in Greek are regularly construed with the *participle* and with the infinitive only by way of exception. Cf. Kühner Gramm. § 658. The order is: *ὄμμα γὰρ κατηγορεῖ σου εὖ φρονοῦντος*, "your eye betrays your friendly sympathy."

V. 272. I adopt the punctuation *τί γάρ*; suggested by Schütz and applauded by Hermann, in lieu of the more common *τί γὰρ τὸ πιστ. κ. τ. λ.*—The formula *τί γάρ*; expresses an emphatic question with reference to the language of another, to which some explanation is demanded, and is sometimes, as in this instance, followed by an additional question from the same speaker. It=the Latin *Quid ergo?* German *Wie so? Wie aber?* "How so? But how is this?" Cf. Soph. Oed. Col. 539, 542, 546, and Philoct. 1405. The chorus, not satisfied with the bare announcement of the intelligence received, wishes to know on what sort of evi-

dence the truth of it rested, and resumes with reference to v. 260. *Quid ergo? an tibi hoc est certum hujus rei indicium?* The τό simply indicates, that the predicate πιστόν is the emphatic part of the sentence. Schneider, however, follows Robertellus in putting τὶ instead of τί, i. e., "and is there aught that's certain (reliable) a proof to you of this?" The γάρ in question is frequently thus used in the sense of the German *denn* or of the Latin *nam*, to which the English *and—then*, or *and* simply, generally correspond, sometimes perhaps "pray (tell me)," rarely the ironical *scilicet*, "forsooth." So also πῶς γὰρ οὔ; "and why not?" in the affirmative answer, and πῶς γάρ; or πόθεν γάρ; "and how could I?" i. e., *minime*, "by no means!" in negative answers. In all these expressions, as well as in the optative εἰ γάρ, εἴθε γάρ, "if only! would that!" and in the frequent Attic ἀλλὰ γάρ,, there is an obvious ellipsis of the sentence, to which γάρ serves to introduce either a *reason* or an explanation, sometimes an objection. This ellipsis, or rather this contraction of two propositions into one, is particularly frequent in the Dialogue (in Plato and in the Drama), where the omitted clause may always be supplied, or rather inferred, from what precedes; although the stereotype character of these formulas does not always require us to render a strict account of each separate component, provided we give their equivalent (or something analagous to it) in English. The formula τί γάρ; has, however, sometimes also an argumentative force and = the Latin *quidni enim?* "How could I (you, he, &c.) do otherwise? or: Why not? To be sure!" Cf. Schneider to v. 1119 of this play. The language of the chorus, therefore, might be rendered: "And how could I do otherwise (than shed tears of joy)? Is the certainty of these a sign to you?" But this is not probable, and our other renderings make decidedly the best sense here. Cf. Kühner's Gramm. § 833, i; Rost Gr. Gramm. p. 739; Zumpt. Lat. Gramm. § 769, and Ast ad Platon. Protag. p. 136.

V. 273. ἔστιν, *it is*, i. e., πιστόν. The proof of what I communicated to you *is reliable*. The τί δ' οὐχί; the same

as the more common πῶς γὰρ οὔ; denotes a strong affirmation: "most certainly, why should it not be so?"

The μὴ δολώσαντος θεοῦ is correctly explained by the Scholiast: εἰ μήπω θεός με ἀπατᾷ. The θεός here alluded to may either be Hesphaistos or *a God* in general. "Dictum hoc est ex ea opinione, quae deos non potentia solum sed etiam sapientia mundum regere opinatur, neque a prudentia et calliditate hanc sapientiam discernit. Itaque μηχαναῖς agere dicuntur dii v. 635. Discernitur neque a violentia Deorum potestas, neque a comitate benevolentia, neque a calliditate sapientia." Klausen.

V. 274. The interrogative πότερα (or πότερον) always serves to introduce a double question and should properly be followed by an ἤ, ἤ οὐ, or ἢ μή, as the case may require. The second member of this compound question, however, is sometimes either entirely suppressed, or introduced by a different particle, which in this instance is the ἀλλ' ἤ of v. 267. Cf. Wunder ad Sophoc. Ajac. 452 and Kühner § 836. —εὐπειθῆ, or as Blomf. has it εὐπιθῆ, is here employed in an active sense "easily persuading, i. e., delusive."—σέβειν, "to make much account of," "attach importance to." So Prometh. 526 σέβει θνατοὺς ἄγαν; Eumen. 651 πράγματ' οὐ λαχὼν σέβεις id. 685. τὸ μὴ 'δικεῖν σέβοντες ἐν διαιρέσει.

V. 275. The gen. φρενός may either depend on λάβοιμι or on δόξαν,, without any material alteration of the sense. δόξα, an opinion in a subjective sense, hence one that is liable to be erroneous, a *fancy, delusion.*

V. 276. The formula ἀλλ' ἤ is often used interrogatively, when the question is opposed to some thought present in the mind of the speaker, or when some objection is made in the form of a question. Thus by Plato *passim.* Here, however, it corresponds to the πότερα of v. 265. "Or did perhaps, on the other hand?" &c. Cf. Kühner § 835, 4.

There has been great confusion in regard to the true import of the word ἄπτερος of this passage, as well as of the Homeric expression τῇ δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο μῦθος, which occurs in Odyss. xvii, 57; xix, 29, xxi, 386; xxii, 397. The synonymous definitions of the later Greeks themselves are

numerous, but vague and destitute of all logical precision. The Scholiast ad h. l. gives *ἰσόπτερος, κούφη* as equipollents. Hesychius makes *ἄπτερα=ἰσόπτερα, ταχέα, ἡδέα.* And again *ἄπτερος· αἰφνίδιος, παρὰ Ὁμήρῳ. ὁ προσηνὴς ἢ ταχύς. Αἰσχύλος Ἀγαμέμνονι· αἰφνίδιον.* The Etymol. Magn. p. 133, 26, defines the *ἄπτερος* of Odyss. xvii, 57 by *ταχὺς πρὸς τὸ πεισθῆναι, καὶ ἰσόπτερος. ἡ γάρ ᾱ στέρησις δηλοῖ καὶ τὸ ὅμοιον καὶ τὸ ἴσον, οἷον ἀτάλαντος, ἄλοχος. ἔνιοι δέ, οὐ παραπτάς, ἀλλ' ἔμμονος. ἔνιοι δέ, ἄπτερον τὸ ἡδύ, ἄσμενον, ὀρθόν.* And again on page 133, 34 the Etymologus explains the adverbial form *ἀπτερέως* (of Hesiod, Parmenides, &c.) by *ἀψοφέως. ταχέως. ἑτοίμως, ἀφροντίστως. οἱ δέ, ἀπροθύμως, ἐλαφρῶς. ἔνιοι δέ, ἠμελημένως.* We must resort to the etymology of the word, in order to eliminate from this confused mass of definitions such as are legitimate. This leads us to two distinct significations with various modifications:—

1. With the Alpha Privative, of which *a*). "wingless, i. e. unfledged," as Eurip. Iphig. Taur. 1096 *ἄπτερος ὄρνις*; and Herc. Fur. 1033 *ἄπτερον ὠδῖνα τέκνων* (= *ἀπτέρων ὠδῖνα τέκνων*).

b). "wingless, i. e., without wings," as Aeschylus, Eumenid. 51, said of the Furies, *ἄπτεροί γε μὴν ἰδεῖν*; and Plato's Phaedr. 256 (ed. Ast.), *ἄνθρωπος ζῶον ἄπτερον.*

c.) "wingless, i. e., not accomplished by wings," said of a flight, Aeschyl. Eumenid. 237, *ὑπέρ τε πόντον ἀπτέροις πωτήμασιν ἦλθον.*

d). With reference to the passage from the Odyssey, "wingless," i. e., *οὐ παραπτάς ἀλλ' ἔμμονος, non avolans,* "abiding, fixed, confined." This signification, most probably the true one for Odyss. xvii. 57, admits of two interpretations of that passage. The one is: and the word to her was wingless, i. e., "her word was wingless, not a word escaped her lips," where the *ἄπτερος μῦθος* is directly the opposite of the frequent Homeric *ἔπεα πτερόεντα*, "the winged words," such as escaped with winged speed from the lips, to which also the *φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων* is applied.—The other is: "the words (spoken to Penelope) were

ἄπτερος, i. e., ἔμμενος in her mind," she treasured them up, they escaped her not again.

2. The second signification of ἄπτερος (with the Alpha Copulative, after the analogy of ἀτάλαντος, &c.,) is ἰσόπτερος, "winglike, winged," in the sense of either: *a*) ταχύς, "swift, speedy"; or *b*) αἰφνίδιος, "sudden, unexpected;" or lastly *c*) κούφος, ἐλαφρός, fluttering, vague, uncertain, empty." The remaining definitions of the Etymologus ταχὺς πρὸς τὸ πεἰσθῆναι, ἡδὺς, ἄσμενος, etc., are not supported by any examples, and are probably erroneous; certainly so, when applied to the Homeric expression above quoted, or to any passage of Aeschylus, where the word occurs. The meaning then of our ἄπτερος φάτις does not lie far off. It is either an *unfledged*, i. e., uncertain *rumor*, to which no credit is to be given, or else "a swift, sudden, vague, empty rumor." Klausen's ἄναυδις φάτις, *praesagitio*, is a contradiction of terms and entirely inadmissible.—That the verb πιαίνειν is here used in a figurative sense, "to fill, possess, satisfy, delight," as in v. 1654, it is scarcely necessary to remark. The verse is evidently closely linked to the last question of the chorus. "Since you discard the idea of placing any confidence in the fleeting visions of dreams, did then perchance some winged report possess your thoughts?"

ART. V.—RELIGIOUS TRAINING; OR THE GOSPEL EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

We propose in this paper—essentially supplemental to an article on the Apostolic Commission—to discuss the subject of religious training or the divine method of preparing man for piety and religion here, and for eternal life in the world to come.

All conceivable shades of religious belief and practice may be conveniently ranged under two general heads, thus forming two separate and distinct systems—the one depending, for subsistence, on momentary impulses or animal excitement, by means of the natural will and affections, the other on a spiritual real communion with God in Christ, through the medium of an enlightened faith. The one system is natural, the other supernatural—the one carnal, the other spiritual—the one human and earthly, the other heavenly and divine. The natural system is peculiarly unsteady, showy, and, according to its manifestations, endlessly diversified—ranging from the lowest forms of heathenism, upward through successive stages, to the most refined and subtle forms of heresy, or religious delusion, which come to us in the name of religion and of a higher spiritual Christianity. All such natural religion, starting, though it may be, in the spirit, ends universally in the flesh. Destitute of principle, it is ever shifting its ground; and yet, in all its changes and endless transformations, it remains essentially true to itself. It is based on Nature and on natural capacities; and is in consequence, selfish, proud, boastful, presumptuous, and full of hypocrisy—the religion of the Scribes and Pharisees! The other system is less versatile, showy, and ambitious; it is humble and meek, and exceedingly diffident, and submissive to the authority of Jesus Christ; but, for this very reason also, it is

infinitely more consistent, real, and substantial. It has no confidence in the flesh; but steadily hopes in the living God. It is confiding, calm, and rational—leaning with sweet composure upon the gracious provisions of the everlasting covenant. It is essentially a *system of grace*, whose main feature is "faith"; whose hope consists in this, that the foundation of God standeth sure, having this double seal: "The Lord knoweth them that are His;" and, "Let every one, that nameth the name of Christ, depart from iniquity."

This covenant system necessarily presupposes, for its full and complete success, certain educational processes or religious instruction. That the idea of God's kingdom or general plan of redemption includes that of spiritual training also, cannot, it seems to us, escape the notice of even the most casual observer. It lies in the very nature of that kingdom, as a nursery of piety and school of the Spirit, that it should include in its system of operation such disciplinary processes as our view of the subject assumes. Without stopping to fortify this position, by special and extended citations from the sacred Scriptures, it will be sufficent to adduce only this one explicit and strong testimony of Jesus Christ himself, in His grand intercessory prayer: "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou has sent."

This language, it seems to us, is decisive of the point. The idea brought to view here, evidently is; The essential connection between the knowledge of God, in Christ, and eternal life; and, as the *cultivation* of this divine knowledge requires a corresponding series of divine institutions, ordinances, and means of grace,—so the entire system may be appropriately termed the Divine Method, or *Gospel Educational System*, in distinction from the merely *natural and impulsive.*

By the term, Gospel Educational System, is meant that peculiar style of Christianity or system of religion, which seeks the cultivation of piety and virtue by means of faithful religious instruction or the inculcation of truth—that

system, which, discarding all confidence in the flesh and in human contrivances generally, plants itself upon the "everlasting covenant;" and, seeking its first glimmerings of hope, as well as all succeeding divine communications, "through the mercy of God unto eternal life," *only* and exclusively in this covenant state, builds up itself and its subjects in "the nurture and admonition of the Lord"—not by occasional spasmodic efforts, but by a diligent use of the ordinary means of grace, established in the Church, according to that beautiful saying of St. Jude: "Ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, unto eternal life."

This is a general outline of the Gospel system, necessarily assuming and cheerfully acknowledging an essential connection between the knowledge of God in Christ, and eternal life; and it will be the object of this paper, first, distinctly to define and illustrate this educational system, then briefly to review the history of it as furnished in the sacred Scriptures, and, finally, to point out some pertinent reasons for its continued observance on the part of the Church.

It has been already assumed, that, without the knowledge of God in Christ, there can be no genuine religion; but this implies also, that, where there is such an experimental knowledge of the mystery of "God manifest in the flesh," we actually do "have eternal life." The connection between the two things is not accidental, but necessary and essential. The one conditions the other, and constitutes its only and absolutely indispensable basis. That such a knowledge of God *is* "eternal life," appears clearly from the fact, that it is possible only to the "new creation in Christ"—to such as are in the covenant, and share the illumination of the Holy Ghost. In the deepest and truest sense of the term, can no man "call Jesus Lord except by the Holy Ghost." Hence the great mass of the fleshly-minded Jews rejected Christ, "but as many as received

Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to as many as believed on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." How this object is effected, and by what means men are introduced into this blessed state, we are informed in the Saviour's address to Nicodemus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh—naturally—is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit—according to God's appointment—is Spirit. Marvel not that I said unto you, ye must be born again." Paul, as already intimated, positively asserts that "no man can call Jesus Lord except by the Holy Ghost." So intimate and vital is the relation between the knowledge of God in Christ, and the illumination of the Holy Ghost, that they cannot be separated; and yet the saving gifts of the Spirit are promised only to the children of the covenant. When the penitent Jews said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles: "Men and brethren, what shall we do? Peter answered and said unto them: Repent, and be baptized every one of you—old and young—in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Such was the apostolic assurance, given to the inquiring Jews, on condition of hearty repentance for sin and believing submission to the ordinance of salvation—baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. The word of promise was confidently spoken; the assurance of pardon and divine illumination given, and the penitent inquirers invited to avail themselves of the proffered mercy by submitting to the proposed condition. "Then they, that gladly received his word, were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Now, in the communion of the Church—"the pillar and ground of the truth"—they found the desired rest, that rest which the world can neither give nor take away. In

short, they found here an abiding, cheering, satisfying home for their spirits. Hence, "they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and of breaking of bread, and in prayers."

See how absolutely one thing is made to hang upon another. The preached word—full of divine power, and of subduing, saving, sanctifying influence—had its effect. Sin, in all its deformity, stood out to the view of the offenders. They quailed under its condemning power. Conviction was followed by inquiry—sincere, earnest inquiry—after salvation; and this by an Apostolic injunction to repentance and baptism, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins and the receiving of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. The truly penitent complied with this injunction, and so obtained assurance of the Apostles' doctrine, access to their blessed fellowship, participation in the sacrament of the altar, and an interest in the public prayers; and, what is more than all, they enjoyed in this covenant state the grace of perseverance, so that they "continued steadfastly" *in* the same, and thus obtained assurance of what John says, "that whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world."

Hence we see the necessity of implicit faith in the doctrines of Christ, submission to the order of salvation, and an abiding union and communion with the Redeemer's person and kingdom. When He taught His disciples the necessity of a real participation in his mediatorial life—His person and doctrine—His sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension to the right hand of God, and His continued intercession with the Father,—when He said: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you,"—many of His disciples, stumbling at the strange and bold declaration, said: "This is an hard saying, who can hear it?" But, "when Jesus knew in Himself that His disciples murmured at it, He said unto them: doth this offend you?" and immediately proceeded to propound still greater mysteries, even the exaltation of His human person—"the Son of Man"—to the right hand of

God, and the necessity of a divine influence—a power from on high—to enable any one even to come unto Him. This gave still greater offence, as it effectually checked the pride of the natural heart, and pointed to an *order of grace*, as the only ground on which to hope for an interest in His atonement. "From that time many of His disciples," we are told, "went back and walked no more with Him." The outward and superficial connection, which they had formed with their Lord, could not bear these strong and far-reaching requirements. The seed of the divine word had not taken sufficient root in them. They were but "way-side" hearers, and consequently unsettled. "Then said Jesus unto the twelve: will ye also go away?" The time-servers, who have been but slightly moved by the power of the truth, and have never experienced its regenerating power, —*these* have left me: will *ye* also leave me? "Then Simon Peter answered Him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe, and are sure, that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God?"

Now observe here again the order of events, and the mutual dependence of the several facts stated. Jesus taught the disciples the "mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven." Some took offence, and said: "this is a hard saying." Jesus does not recall or in any way soften his words. He rather insists on all He had said, and more besides, as necessary to salvation. Many of His disciples forsake Him. He turns to the twelve chosen ones, who had enjoyed not only His public preaching, but also His more private and particular instructions, in reference to the mysteries of the kingdom of God, to know which it was given to them *only*, and not to such as were "without." What was the effect which this private and more familiar and specific instruction, in the mysteries of religion, had on the twelve? Had the truth found its way to their hearts and there laid the foundation of a permanent adherence to Christ and His cause? When Jesus said, "will ye also go away?" one, in the name and behalf of himself and the rest, answered:

"Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe, and are sure, that Thou art that Christ—the Son of the living God." Here is an outcoming of the life of faith. Evidently, they were so bound up with and attached to Christ, that they could not even think of leaving Him; and the reason of it was, that He had "the words of eternal life"—words which not only *manifested*, but also really possessed and communicated eternal life; and, in consequence of this, they believed and were sure that He was that Christ—"the Son of the living God"—"the Hope of Israel" and "the desire of all nations."

Here we have, at once, the efflorescence and fruit of that unwearied care, and special instruction in the "mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven," which the Saviour had bestowed upon His own highly-favored disciples. He was Himself the Great "Sower" who "went forth to sow." Some seeds in the very nature of things, passed over and beyond the cultivated beds in the garden of the Lord, and *so* fell by the way-side, where, unburied and exposed, they were either trodden under foot of men or devoured by the fowls of the air. Others again fell, indeed, inside of the sacred enclosure, and upon cultivated ground, but on a subsoil rock, which, for want of soil and moisture, effectually prevented their growth unto perfection. Others, again, falling also within the sacred enclosure and there sprouting were afterwards choked, and rendered unproductive, by the "thorns and briers" which sprung up from the remaining roots of bitterness—the unsubdued lusts—that still lurked in the rich soil. In these several ways much of the seed was lost; yet "others fell on good ground," and sprung up. and produced an abundant harvest, of which these chosen twelve were the most eminent "first fruits."

The efficient means or instrumental cause of this regenerating process was the word of Christ,—or those "words of eternal life," whose divine power and energy the Apostles had so nobly confessed. Hence also all Christians

universally are represented as "being born again" by a supernatural power—"not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, even the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever!" And Paul, speaking of this "mystery among the Gentiles," which is Christ in them the "hope of glory," very significantly says: "Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." And to Timothy he says, "take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for, in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee."

These references are sufficient to show that "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God"—that men are to be saved by a "manifestation of the truth"—that it has "pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Hence our adorable Lord appropriately said unto the Jews: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." And, in His grand intercessory prayer to His Father, He says: "Sanctify them by Thy truth; Thy word is truth." It must be evident to all that there is an essential connection between the knowledge of God in Christ, and eternal life, and that the great object of the ministry, therefore, should be to make known, in their daily ministrations "the unsearchable riches of Christ"—faithfully to "preach the word; to be instant in season and out of season; to reprove, rebuke, exhort, with long-suffering and doctrine"—in short, to "make disciples of all nations, by baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and then "TEACHING them to observe all things whatsoever Christ Himself has commanded"—diligently training these plants of righteousness for heaven and eternal life. Such is evidently the great end and purpose of the Christian ministry, and such its relation to men and their salvation. Hence Paul magnifies his office and claims special honor for the ambassadors of heaven. He desires that men "should so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God."

Such substantially is *the nature* of this Gospel Educational Scheme. Let us endeavor briefly to *review its history*, as furnished in the sacred Scriptures. The system presupposes *discipleship*, or separation from the world and a sacramental incorporation with the kingdom of God. It is not in the order of nature, but of grace, that this divine system holds. It has no confidence in the flesh, and trusts not in "bodily exercises" or human devices. Under it men are to be spiritually trained—brought up in "the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

This spiritual training we find amply provided for in the orginal covenant made with the "father of the faithful." The Lord appeared unto Abraham, and said: "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee." The peculiarities of this covenant consist in its freeness or sovereignty —its permanence—universality—and exclusiveness. It is a gracious covenant, because it was not only wholly *unmerited*, but even unsolicited: God appeared unto Abraham and proposed its establishment. It is permanent and abiding, inasmuch as it is an "everlasting covenant, in all things well ordered and sure." It is universal, because it includes all the posterity of Abraham, naturally and spiritually also, "all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call," the Gentiles! It was made with him, and with his seed after him, in their generations. And, finally, it is exclusive, in that it guarantees its rich gifts and immunities to its own particular subjects alone. Aliens and strangers could lay no claim to these divine blessings. All that remained outside of the covenant, were, by virtue of their very position, excluded from the people of God and His covenant mercies, so far, at least, as they came externally within its reach and yet refused to embrace its gracious provisions in penitence and faith and by an unconditional submission to the order of grace. So much for the covenant itself and its esssential peculiarities. Now FIDELITY to this covenant and its provisions constituted for

the ancients the only sure guaranty of the divine favor and of a saving knowledge of the truth. On this ground only did God make known to them the counsels of His will. So, in Gen. 18 : 17–19, the Lord said : "Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do ; seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him ? for I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment ; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him." This corresponds with what David said—that "the secret of the Lord is with them that fear him," and that "He will show them His covenant ;" or, in other words, that He will make known to them the counsels of His will, and "fulfill all their desires."

This whole covenant system was re-affirmed, and formally established in the Mosaic Law. When God had solemnly confirmed His covenant with Israel, through the mediation of His servant Moses, the stern law-giver earnestly entreated them to remain faithful to this blessed relation, saying : "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart ; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thine house and on thy gates." In this diversified form of speech, so earnest and moving, does Moses entreat the church of his day to "keep the word of God," and diligently to teach its blessed doctrines to her children. And upon the faithful observance of these commands he suspends their prosperity both as a nation and a church. On this ground only was it to be well with them and their children after them, and they were to go

in and possess the land which the Lord, had promised unto their fathers. In remaining faithful to the covenant they have the assurance of great spiritual prosperity, and of very peculiar favors from God, who says: "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring: and they shall spring up as among grass—as willows by the water courses. One shall say: I am the Lord's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel." In these touchingly beautiful words the prophet delineates the cheerful piety of the young—the children of pious and faithful parents—impatiently pressing into the kingdom of God, and offering themselves as "living sacrifices" upon His holy altar. And such undoubtedly would *always* be the case, if only parents could be brought to see clearly, and earnestly to perform, their solemn obligations to God and their children. But too often they betray their solemn trust, practically despise the covenant of God, and readily fall in with every popular movement that may assume the task of making conversions "by might and by power," instead of expecting the salvation of themselves and their children by the silent operations of the Spirit of God in the use of the ordinary means of grace established in the Church. How exceedingly common, now-a-days, is such apostacy from the divine covenant and its gracious provisions; and how terribly true is it, that the iniquity of such parents as exchange the divine order of grace for human fancies and "bodily exercises," is visited upon their "children to the third and fourth generation" even—until, not unfrequently, we see entire communities, once flourishing as the garden of the Lord, reduced to a barren waste, where not a solitary flower is seen to bloom or breathe its sweet fragrance in devotion to the skies. As far out as the eye can reach all is desolate and bleak, unless the dull monotony broken by the occasional appearance of some deluded victim, who, though now par-

tially awakened from his dreams, sees his error when too late to avoid the terrible cataract which threatens to sweep him away in its resistless course. Far different is it with such as have embarked in the ship of Christ—the ark of salvation! She rides triumphant on the storm-tossed bosom of life's rough sea; and both herself and her precious treasures are safe, because Jesus, the eternal Son of God, is in her midst. Her trust is in the living God; and "the Highest Himself shall establish her." Every foe is destined to perish. "All her children also shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of her children." Her ministry *now*, as ever, is a ministry of life, light, and love. So was it formerly in the case of Levi of whom God says: "My covenant was with him of life and of peace; and I gave them to him for the fear wherewith he feared me, and was afraid before my name. The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips: he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity: for the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts."

Such is the Old Testament view of this subject. All is suspended on the "everlasting covenant." This brought men into new and peculiar relations to God. It secured them His favor and benediction, and afforded grounds of "faith, hope, and charity:" in a word, it transferred men from a state of nature to a state of grace, and thus opened the way for special religious culture—the spiritual training of men for the kingdom of Heaven. And how is it in the New Testament? Here we find the old system not only fully sanctioned in all its essential features, relations, and parts, but likwise permanently established and brought to perfection. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets," says Christ, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill"—that is, to fill up and bring to perfection that which before existed only in outline. Jesus Christ, during His own personal ministry, not only preached the gosel publicly, but also taught, in a private and

more familiar way, His own disciples, because unto them it was "given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." He clearly recognized also the peculiar provisions of the ancient covenant, which guaranteed salvation equally to believing parents and their children. "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not," said He, "for of such is the kingdom of God: and He took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them." When, on a subsequent occasion, He saw the generous-hearted Zaccheus on the Sycamore tree, He said unto him: "Make haste, and come down; for to-day I must abide at thy house; and he made haste, and came down, and received Him joyfully:" and in spite of the murmurs of the Pharisees, Jesus said unto Him: "this day is salvation come to this house, for as much as he also is a son or Abraham"—the divine blessing thus descending upon distant generations!

After these preliminary observations, it is hoped, we shall be able, in some measure at least, to appreciate the nature and extent of the last great commisssion, which, shortly before His ascension, Christ gave to His apostles. This commission, which we have treated in a special article, requires some further notice in this place; for, in all our inquiries respecting the nature of the Christian ministry and of the Christian system generally, it must be taken as our absolute and indispensable rule or name. Only in the light of this grand chart is it possible for us to understand fully the system of the gospel. What then is the nature and import of this commission? It is couched in these remarkable words: "All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth: go ye, therefore, and teach—disciple—all nations, (by) baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Here we have three things: *first*, a claim, on the part of Jesus, to universal power and dominion; *secondly*, a commission given to the apostles and their successors forever, empowering them to go and disciple all nations,

or, as Mark has it, to evangelize every creature; and, *thirdly*, a promise of Christ's gracious presence to the end of time, assuring them of success in their arduous and responsible work. And what are the terms of this commission so far as it relates to the nature of the Christian ministry and the course to be pursued by those in office in preparing men for the life to come?

It is said: "Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations, by baptizing them," etc. An exact parallel this to the provisions of the old covenant. According to the Scriptures, the first step in the order of salvation is to bring men into the covenant. Outside of this all is under the curse—hopelessly involved in the sin of our first parents. Here all is dark and cheerless. Death reigns triumphant in the world. The only refuge is Jesus Christ, the righteous. This is what Paul means, when he says: "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Nothing is left to man himself. All centres in Christ. "Know ye, therefore, that they which be of faith, the same are the children of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise" —even as the everlasting covenant was before confirmed of God in Christ. And, now, as the children of the covenant, in the Old Testament economy, were to be diligently trained, and instructed in the doctrines of salvation, so too our blessed Redeemer enjoins it upon His apostles, and they again upon their successors, to bring up the children of the covenant in the "nurture and admonition of the Lord;" or, as the Redeemer Himself ordains, "the stewards of the mysteries of God" were carefully to train, for usefulness and happiness, those whom they had constituted disciples, "teaching them to observe" the commands of their Lord and Master: and only in so doing, had they the promise of His gracious presence and blessing.

The apostles evidently so understood their high commission, and acted accordingly. Look at the first grand display of divine power in connection with the preaching of the gospel. When, on the day of Pentecost, the peni-

tent Jews asked: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter answered—"Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here is the divine requisition. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized," and so brought into the church and covenant of God, and entitled to its blessings and privileges. Here they felt at home; and consequently "they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Here is a regular system of truth, which lay at the bottom of all that follows—the communion of the saints—the "breaking of bread," or Sacrament of Christ's body and blood—and prayers," or the united worship of God's house. This system of truth, or apostolic doctrine is elsewhere called "the faith"—i. e., the universally received system of truth or doctrine, containing and exhibiting the faith of God's elect—the apostolic doctrinal formula—that "most holy faith" which according to St. Jude, "was once delived to the Saints," and for which all were commanded "earnestly to contend."

This system of faith consisted of connected series of religious truths, very much as we now have it in the Apostles' Creed, whose general outlines, only in a reversed order, are found in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. Chap. 4: 1–6. This universal faith of the church is that "form of sound words" which the youthful Timothy was to "hold fast," as having received it of Paul, the aged, in "faith" and love, which is in Christ Jesus." Into this "most holy faith" all converts were baptized, and exhorted to be "established" in the same, "even as they had been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving." Col. 2: 7. Here again the most careful religious instruction is presupposed. This systematic instruction in the Christian faith, was, in its simplest form, usually styled "catechising," and consisted in a brief, simple, and comprehensive statement of Christian doctrine, generally in the way of question and answer—based on the history of Christ, especially his in-

carnation, life of obedience, death, resurrection, and ascension to the right hand of God, "where He ever liveth to make intercession for the Saints according to the will of God."

For the evidence of these statements we refer to the beginning of St. Luke's gospel, where he gives as a reason for "setting forth in order" the facts of the gospel history or a "declaration of those things which are most surely believed," that he wishes his beloved Theopholus to "know the *certainty* of those things wherein he had been instructed" or catechised (*κατηχήθης*) as it is in the original. The idea is that he wishes to give, in a condensed form, the history of our redemption, which history constitutes the basis of the church's "faith"—the system of doctrine "once delivered to the saints," and by them handed down from generation to generation, until it was gradually embodied in what is now popularly called the Apostles' Creed. That such elementary instruction or catechisation was current in the Church, during the Apostolic period, is evident from the frequent recurrence of such expressions as the "faith"—"the words of faith and of knowledge"—"the form of sound words"—and, generally, the "faith," which Christians are said to "have been taught," and others of like import. It is equally clear that this system of religious instruction was substantially the same as that which is involved in the conception of the original covenant with Abraham, and the practice of which by him was so highly commended of God,—the same as that which was subsequently incorporated in the Mosaic Laws and institutions. All this is clear from a comparison of what Paul says in Rom. 2: 18, and Gal. 6: 6. In the former passage he represents a Jew as "being instructed" or catechised "out of the law" (*κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου*) as the Greek has it. In the latter passage, Paul say: "Let him that is taught (literally catechised—*κατηχούμενος*) in the word, communicate unto him that teacheth *τῷ κατηχοῦντι*—(catechises—the catechist) in all good things." From this place it is evident that catechisation or the familiar instruc-

tion of the young and unexperienced was a prominent feature in the pastoral work of the Apostolic period. And this excellent custom, as we learn from history, was continued in the Church afterwards, and has always been regarded by the great mass of professing Christians as the only sure guarantee of a *sound faith*, and of a pure, rational, and consistent practical Christianity.

Hence this System—Gospel Educational System—has been very generally esteemed and practiced by the great and good of all ages and countries. The early Church made immense account of it; established schools for the special training of catechists; and thus supplied the Church with a multitude of competent, practical, and efficient teachers. Luther, as we had occasion to observe in our article on the great commission, exercised himself very extensively in the composition of Catechisms for the use of children and youth. Melancthon added the most brilliant star to his crown by composing the Augsburg Confession. Zwingli and his coadjutors provided the Swiss Churches with a formulary, or rather formularies, of the faith; and Calvin, the master spirit of the age, concentrated all his mighty energies upon this important point, and plucked his sweetest and most fragrant flowers in this delightful field of pastoral activity. Last, but not least, on the soil of continental Europe, we have Ursinus and Olevianus engaged in composing our own inimitable symbol—the Heidelberg Catechism. And later still, though in part also earlier, we see the English and Scotch Churches coming up to this good work, and laying upon the altar, in complete form, the "Thirty Nine Articles," and the "Westminster Confession," as an enduring monument of their faith and love, and as an evidence of their affectionate sympathy with the Church Catholic in this particular department of Christian discipline. How beautiful and touching the thought, that, in this respect at least, the Church was of one heart and of one mind—that in this one particular point, the universal pulse of the Christian Church beat in harmony, and thus gave some faint intima-

tion prophetically of that blessed state of the Christian world, when all the genuine disciples of the crucified One shall see eye to eye, and work hand in hand, coöperating with perfect unanimity in building up the kingdom of Christ and in rearing a spiritual temple to the honor of their divine Lord and Redeemer!

Having, to some extent, defined and illustrated the subject under review—traced the history of the Gospel Educational System as furnished in the sacred Scriptures and corroborated by the history of the Church,—and having, in the course of our remarks, shown the relation subsisting between the knowledge of God in Christ and eternal life, and the consequent necessity for spiritual training or specific religious instruction, we shall yet, in conclusion, point out a few of the most pertinent reasons for continuing in the belief and practice of this ancient and venerable system.

We may begin by asserting that this system has the highest possible sanctions. It was originally appointed by the Lord Himself, for the use of His Church, and by her perpetuated from generation to generation. The conscientious practice of this system was commenced by Abraham, "the father of the faithful." It laid the foundation of his subsequent greatness and prosperity, spiritual and temporal. "For I know him," says God, "that he will command his children, and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, and do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him." It was made an integral part of the Mosaic systems and thus served to exert a mighty, far-reaching, and controling influence on the destiny of nations, and of generations to come, down to the end of time. It was also fully and expressly sanctioned by our Lord, and incorporated in the system of the Gospel. It was solemnly enjoined upon the Apostles, in their high commission, as we have seen, and by them faithfully practiced during their personal ministry. It was fondly cherished, maintained, and perpetuated by the early Church. It has

come down even to us, by regular succession, as the dearest inheritance of the Church. It bears accordingly, the seal of God's own most perfect approval, not only by being his own special appointment at first, but also by being amply attested in the experience of a long line of martyrs and confessors, who lived and died in the love and defense of this system. This noble army of saints furnish, by their heroic faith, dauntless courage, and unexampled sufferings in the cause of truth and righteousness, the most convincing evidence of the divine power and excellence of the religion of Christ, especially in that peculiar form which constituted the basis of their spiritual training.

This ancient system also has "exceeding great and precious promises." It holds out the highest encouragement to parents, pastors, and teachers. It speaks with confidence of the final results of all properly conducted educational efforts. It says, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and, when he is old, he will not depart from it." This beautiful apothem has found many a blessed fulfillment in the history and experience of the Church. All the promises of God have been tested, and found to be really "yea and amen." Jesus Christ Himself conformed to this system, and was blessed in the deed. In infancy already, His pious and devoted parents presented Him to God according to the provisions of the ancient covenant; and in connection with this fact, it is significantly said: "the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon Him." Such was the infancy or childhood of Jesus—perfectly natural, and, in all respects, conformed to the common order of human life. When twelve years of age, His parents took Him along to Jerusalem to attend one of the grand national festivals. Unaffected by the external splendor of the holy city and of the temple, and wholly occupied with the thoughts of the spirit world, He found His chief delight in sitting at the feet of the wise and learned, in the courts of the temple, where His parents subsequently found Him, "sitting in the midst af the doctors, both hearing them,

and asking them questions ;" and all this with special reference, no doubt, to His entrance into the congregation of Israel, as the custom *always* was for children, when twelve years of age or in their thirteenth year, thus passing over from being "children of the covenant" simply, to being also "children of the congregation" or "sons of the Law." Here again the youthful Saviour, just as before and afterwards, "fulfilled all righteousness," or, in other words, conformed cheerfully to the customs of His people and the requirements of the Law. And it is *remarkable* that here again the sacred record says : "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."

When Jesus Christ commissioned His apostles to go into all the world, and preach His gospel to every creature, or, according to Matthew, to make disciples of all nations, by baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them, He added: "Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." Now the meaning and force of such a promise of the divine presence *always* is, as might easily be shown, that God gives success to the cause of the person with whom He promises to be ; and this promise of Christ, taken in this sense, was abundantly verified in the mighty achievements and wonderful success of the apostles and their successors in office. They were permitted to preach the gospel and administer its sealing ordinances with much joy and assurance, "God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will." Under the divine guidance and benediction they turned many to righteousness, and led to the feet of Jesus multitudes who were afterwards to shine as "stars in the crown of their rejoicing."

Again, this system makes due account of the established means of grace, the scriptural and permanent provisions for the spiritual birth, growth, and perfection of God's children. It equally esteems both word and sacrament.

The penitent sinner, who has been "quickened" by the "word of God which liveth and abideth for ever," is tenderly received, and, "by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost," is incorporated in the kingdom of God—the body mystical of Christ—that so, being "planted in the house of the Lord," he may "flourish in the courts of our God." But *how* are we thus spiritually advanced? We answer by the application of purely divine and supernatural means. As men are not, in the first instance, brought into the Church by "might or by power," but by the "Spirit of the Lord," so *now*, when in the house, they are not fed and nourished with "common" bread, but with that "bread of God, which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." Jesus Christ says: "I am the living bread which cometh down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." Here a new leaf opens in the life of the Saint. The "new creature in Christ" must be sustained and perfected. This requires new bread, spiritual aliment, or "living bread," the eating of which is made an indispensable condition of spiritual and eternal life, and of its maintenance "unto the resurrection of the just." Jesus Himself is said to be "our life," to be "formed in us the hope of glory; and accordingly our life is said to be "hid with Christ in God." So the Holy Ghost, the accomplisher in us of the work of redemption, is said to "take of the things of Christ and show them unto us"—to bind us up with Him in a blessed fellowship—that "*so* we, being many, are one body in Christ, and members one of another," even as we "have been all made to drink into our spirit." Only in this mystical life-union with Christ can we enjoy the gifts of the Holy Ghost—the grace of life—and thereby grow, and be "changed into the same image with Him, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

To see how immensely important to our spiritual growth, and so to our final salvation, is a proper knowledge and

appreciation of the holy sacraments, in connection with the word, we need only recall the solemn and thrillingly interesting declaration of our Lord, in John, where He so emphatically says: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." This is the essential requisite of eternal life. Now, we ask, is there any provision made in God's house for this mystical eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood? Most assuredly there is. This strong language, we assert, finds an echo in the institution of the Holy Supper—the sacrament of the altar. "Take, eat," says Christ, "this is my body;" and he took the cup, saying: "Drink ye all of it; this cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." And Paul says: "the cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread"—i. e., of Christ! So perfectly interlinked are these several means of grace—word and sacrament—which the Holy Ghost employs in our regeneration, conversion, sanctification, and redemption or final glorification, that they can not be separated; and the system of the Church, accordingly, keeps them united, and equally esteems both; does not exalt one at the expense of the other: nor does it continually harp on conversion, only, but seeks also the "edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come, in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man—unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Finally, this system has been, as already shown, successfuly employed, and its extraordinary virtues fairly tested. As a system of divine appointment, and accompained with assurances of the divine favor and benediction,

we might reasonably conclude that it would prove itself highly efficient. It is, in fact, the only system which effectually checks the pride of the human heart, and arises up a standard against the power and influence of Pelagianism. It effectually vindicates the Scriptural view of human depravity and spiritual impotence, by absolutely denying to the "old man" the power of performing "good works." It looks for the possibility of salvation away from nature, and all natural contrivances, to an "order of grace" in the church. It has full faith in the ordinances of God, and in the efficacy of His word. It hesitates not, with Jesus Christ, to say: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." And with Ananias, the good bishop of Damascus, it confidently points the weeping penitent to the ordinance of heaven, saying: "Why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." It looks, for the very first step in the way of genuine repentance and evangelical faith, not to "bodily exercises," and human contrivances, but to the mercy of God in Christ, who saves us "by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost"—that, "being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." It seeks for guarantied security only in the *church*, the antitype of Noah's ark, wherein comparitively few, it is said, were "saved by water" from the general wreck—the perishing world—"the like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer (stipulation) of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Only in this way of divine appointment do we acquire "boldness to enter into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus—having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

In the progress of this blessed work—the work of conversion, sanctification, and redemption—the same divine excellence and superiority of the Gospel Education-

al system over that which is merely natural and impulsive —spiritualized naturalism—are everywhere apparent.— This system firmly holds that no vile person "shall inherit the kingdom of God," and that, because "we all are by nature the children of wrath," it must be said of us, as it was of the Corinthians: "Such *were* some of you; but ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." Hence it is appropriately said, that "Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word; that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Here again the word of God comes prominently into view, as an essential element in the work of salvation. We have already seen that Peter calls it "the incorruptible seed" by whose divine power and energy we are "born again." The Holy Ghost never works independently of this blessed word. It is accordingly called the "word of life," and the "gospel of our salvation," in the use of which we are "quickened" by the Spirit of God, and by Him also "sealed unto the day of redemption." Hence it is said in reference to the word of salvation which was preached and expounded to the soul-stricken Cornelius and "those with him, that, while Peter yet spake these works, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the WORD."

It was no doubt in reference to this overwhelming power of the divine word, and its relation to man's redemption, that, on an earlier occasion, the same Peter said unto Jesus: "Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe, and are sure, that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." Such a full and complete assurance of faith could come only from the implanted word or "words of eternal life" which Jesus spake. These words, accompanied by divine energy and influence, burned into the very substance of the spirit, and became incarnate there—enshrined in the soul as an element of eternal life, quickening, ele-

vating, and transforming the whole inner man into the divine image. Such is the power of the Gospel; and it was doubtless owing to this importance of the word of God, that, in His promise of another comforter—the Holy Ghost—the Redeemer assures His disciples, that, when He, the Spirit of truth, was come, He should guide them into all truth, and bring to their remembrance all things whatsoever He Himself had taught them. And the noble, pure, and generous-hearted Paul exclaims: "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ;" and, in a different connection, he says: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth—to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile."

From the general tenor of our discussion, as well as from the particular remarks, which, in its progress, have been made, we can infer the true nature and purpose of that system of grace which God has established for the salvation of men. The ambassadors of God are commissioned and sent forth, to make known to a dying world "the unsearchable riches of Christ"—in other words, to preach "Jesus Christ and Him crucified," and, in His name, to propose terms of reconciliation. To those who penitently ask, "men and brethren, what shall we do?" they answer: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Here is perfect order. Penitence, anxious inquiries after salvation, Apostolic injunctions, terms, and promises, all follow each other in quick and necessary succession—mutually limiting and conditioning each other, and all looking forward, through penitence and pardon, to the bestowment of the permanent gift of the spirit, in connection with Baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. This "washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost" secures to the penitent believer "an unction from the Holy One," and puts him

in a position, in which he is enabled, to "know all things" necessary to salvation—i. e., accurately to discriminate between what is morally good and morally evil.

Such experimental, spiritual, divine knowledge makes men humble, and willing to sit, with Mary, at the Saviour's feet to hear "the words of eternal life;" or to roam joyfully over the garden of the Lord, gathering flowers of sweetest fragrance and richest hue, to be woven into a garland of beauty for the Redeemer's brow; and, while spiritually gazing, with feelings of unmingled delight upon Him, who is "the resurrection and the life," and contemplating, with silent admiration, His infinite, absolute, divine perfections, they can say with confidence: "THIS GOD IS OUR GOD, FOR EVER AND EVER. HE WILL BE OUR GUIDE EVEN UNTO DEATH."

D. Y. H.

Bethlehem, Pa.

Art. VI.—THE NATIONAL QUESTION.

There are ever two living forces at work in a Commonwealth. The one is the necessity of unity; the other, of subordinate constituents. From these are developed the authority of the whole civil organism and the freedom of its several parts; or the sovereign power of Government and the rights of individuals and communities. Both are legitimate; because both are grounded in the constitution of man. Each possesses claims to a due measure of recognition. These forces are different and opposite, but not contradictory. Like the centripetal and centrifugal forces which hold the planetary system in its sublime unvarying order, the action of each is complemental to the counteraction of the other.

One great problem of society has been to equalize these necessary and unchangeable tendencies, or rather to harmonize them in a system of Government in which both shall have free scope, each meet the demands of the other, and yet neither exceed its proper limits. Government is strong and just, and society well-regulated and prosperous, other things being equal, in the degree that this great end has been attained. In such a commonwealth, Government does not exercise its power in violation of the rights of individuals and communities, and individuals or parties do not usurp the authority vested alone in Government; but both work harmoniously, each within its own province; Government protecting the individual, and respecting all his rights in the enactment, enforcement and execution of laws, whilst individuals support the Government, obey the laws and, when suffering wrong, seek redress according to the provisions of law.

The operation of these forces exposes society to a twofold danger. Either tendency may develop itself abnor-

mally. Overlooking or disregarding the rights of individuals and communities, the authority of Government may become tyranny and oppression. Then arises a conflict between "the powers that be" and individual freedom; the constituted authorities arrogating prerogatives which belong to the people, and the people contending for the rights and privileges which inhere in rational, moral beings. If Government does not yield to their just demands, and the people possess sufficient intelligence, energy and strength, the conflict issues in insurrection and revolution. And a revolution growing out of this cause commands the lively sympathy and firm support of the mass of mankind.

The other danger to society arises from an opposite cause. The people may transcend their province and usurp the prerogatives of Government. True freedom may degenerate into arbitrary will and lawless violence. Then again there arises a conflict between Government and the people, but a conflict of a wholly different character. The relation is just reversed. It is the conservative element as embodied in established Government that joins issue with radicalism; the positive is in conflict with the negative forces of society. The positive element maintains the existing order of civil affairs, sustains the constitution and the laws as they are, or would modify them according to the provisions of the law, and enforces subjection and obedience among all who owe allegiance to the Government. The negative element would change or overturn the existing order on account of its imperfections, whether real or apparent, ignore all obligations, abrogate the law unlawfully, and set aside the civil authority at the dictation of arbitrary opinion. The one would subordinate the passions and impulses of the individual, or a party, to the law of the land; the other would subordinate the law, its interpretation and execution, to the will and caprice of lawless individuals. This conflict may also result in insurrection or a general rebellion. But as the issue is a different one, though the parties to the conflict are the same, so the judgment of mankind concerning it is reversed. Right,

truth and justice are unquestionably on the side of Government.

These primary forces of civilized society are the factors of history; or, more properly, the human factors, as distinguished from the controlling Providence of God, which is the divine factor. Existing in human nature and society as integral elements; they are ineradicable, and their influence irrepressible. Neither one can annihilate the other. The tendency to unity, consolidation and authority, which, when perverted, becomes tyranny and oppression, quickens the idea of individual right and freedom and evokes insurrection and revolution. On the other hand, the innate sense of right and love of freedom which, when perverted, produce anarchy and inaugurate a reign of terror, exhibit the necessity and intensify the desire of established law and civil order. The law of the social organism acts, in such cases, like the law of gravitation on the pendulum of a clock, carrying it to and fro from the one to the other extreme of the arc. Hence neither despotism nor anarchy can be perpetual ; a truth illustrated by the history of the world. Either may continue for a shorter or longer period, according to circumstances ; but each prepares the way and gives place to the other, and must continue to do so in every nation or country until society, advanced to a higher stadium, organizes a form of government in which these contrary forces are in equilibrium. Then if the people possess sufficient intelligence and virtue to sustain it, the stream of history will flow in a smoother channel.

This two-fold principle furnishes the key to the history of the great American Government. The thirteen original colonies, subject to the authority of Great Britain, were content comparatively and prosperous in their state of dependence on the will of the King and the British Parliament, so long as the rights of the people, guaranteed by the constitution of England and the charters of the different colonies respectively, were duly respected. But when these rights were violated; when the British Government, intent mainly on filling the national coffers, enacted the

offensive and oppressive revenue laws of 1763, and followed them, in defiance of the petitions and remonstrances sent to Parliament from all parts of the colonies, by the passage of the odious Stamp Act of March, 1765; when the petitions of the Colonies, which enumerated in dignified and respectful terms the great wrongs they were enduring and besought Parliament on behalf of the inhabitants for no more than the free exercise of the rights they possessed as subjects of the British Crown, were answered by a dogged persistence in unjust legislation, by renewed acts of violence on sea and land, and a tone of supercilious contempt in the entire bearing of George III. and his ministry towards the American people; then the keen sense of injustice and tyranny was fanned into the flame of revolution which spread, as in the twinkling of an eye, throughout the length and breadth of the land. The battle of Lexington, April 19th, 1775, was the opening of a war against the usurpations of governmental authority waged in the name of freedom for eight long years, and terminated in the acknowledgment on the part of Great Britain, of the independence of the thirteen confederated colonies.

The war of the American Revolution was a reaction of the popular mind against the abuses of authority and power by Government,—a reaction that, becoming deeper, stronger and more general from week to week, and month to month, broke forth into overt acts of rebellion only after twelve years' endurance of political and moral wrongs. It was the instinct of an intelligent people educated into the idea of true freedom, as distinguished alike from slavery and licentiousness, despotism and lawlessness, by the constitution and laws of England itself, at once the bulwark of constitutional government and the bold invader of the rights guaranteed by it to the individual.

The treaty of peace signed at Paris, September 3rd, 1783, set the seal of official recognition to the victory gained on the battle-field. The great end was accomplished. The colonies were free from British domination. But a new danger to individual liberty and public order reared its hor-

rid head in the midst of the new-born nation. The colonies were independent of England, and independent of each other. The constitution of 1781 was only a league. It formed nothing more than an association of independent States, each of which claimed and exercised the authority of a sovereign within its own territory. There was no organic unity; no central power; no authority to enact and execute laws for the common weal; no principle of life to energize and consolidate the entire body politic.

The consequence was a process of disintegration and dissolution, which began to show itself so soon as peace had been declared. During the first two years after the Articles of confederation had been adopted, 1781 to 1783, the continuance of the war served as an external occasion to bind the different States together. The sense of a common danger led to mutual coöperation for the purpose of achieving a common independence. But that end once attained and the outward occasion for coöperation no longer existing, the common inheritance exhibited the premonitory symptoms of approaching death. "We had achieved our independence, but we had not constructed a nation. We were not a body politic. No laws could be enforced, no insurrections suppressed, no debt collected. Neither property nor life were secure. Great Britain had made a treaty of peace with us, but she scornfully declined a treaty of commerce and amity; not because we had been rebels, but because we were not a state—because we were a mere dissolving league of jarring provinces, incapable of guarantying the stipulations of any commercial treaty. * * * * For *twelve* years after the acknowledgment of our *independence* we were mortified by the spectacle of foreign soldiers occupying a long chain of fortresses south of the great lakes and upon our own soil. We were a confederacy. We were sovereign States. And these were the fruits of such a confederacy and such a sovereignty."* There was no government. The "powers that be" which are "ordained of God," were not acknowledged by the country, neither

*Motley's Letter to the *London Times*, May 23rd, and 24th, 1861.

did they exist in any real form for the people as a whole. There was not in the land a "minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."† Congress was only the agent and counsellor of a civil association—an association of States having diverse and opposing interests, ruled each by the popular will, and distracted by party intrigues, and party animosities. The country which, by its heroism on the field of blood, had won a recognition of independence, and stood up in moral grandeur proclaiming opposition to tyranny, and civil freedom for the people, in the face of the world, was prostrated by a deep-rooted disease rankling at its heart's core. The pendulum had swung to the opposite extreme of the arc. The centrifugal force of society was unrestrained by the centripetal. The individual will deferred only to the dictates of its arbitrary self; and refused to acknowledge any general authority. The independent colonies were on the eve of anarchy. A fearful abyss was opening its jaws to devour them.

The abnormal action of the integral forces inherent in humanity had, at this period of our history, developed the two great generic, but opposite, evils of society on American soil. The one was the abuse of legitimate authority and power on the part of the British Government, which put upon the people the fetters of a degrading vassalage. The constituted authorities in violation of a most sacred obligation, trod under foot the rights of the people.

The other evil was the abuse of independence and individual freedom, which plunged the American people into a state of incipient anarchy. This was the most critical period in our history. A crisis it was, without doubt, of infinite moment. Rent asunder by sectional jealousy, party feuds, and individual selfishness; without commerce, wealth or credit; burdened with an enormous debt; and secretly undermined by Tory power, still comparatively influential;—the nation lay bleeding from ghastly wounds inflicted by its own hand; whilst the British lion, crouch-

†Rom. 13: 4.

ing on our frontier, was watching for the nick of time to spring upon his helpless victim and crush republican institutions to death under his ruthless paw.

In the Providence of God, light broke in upon the deep, dismal darkness. Through the commanding influence of General Washington and his noble compeers, the people were aroused to a sense of their extreme danger. A national Convention assembled in Philadelphia, representing not the States, but the people as a whole, to construct a Republican Government. The history of the preceding thirty years, and the general confusion and disorder then prevailing, had clearly brought to light the two radical evils to which we have referred. To secure freedom, order and prosperity a two-fold remedy was required; namely, on the one hand, a constitutional government invested with legitimate authority to act directly upon the people, irrespective of State organizations, thus forming one commonwealth of which the States would be integral dependent parts; and, on the other, a guarantee to individuals, communities, States and sections, of all the rights appertaining to each, which are essential to true freedom. The Convention addressed itself, in the fear of God, to the execution of the difficult and momentous work.

Before the revolution the evil consisted in oppression. The people did not possess their rights. They had no voice in the enactment of general laws. Taxes were levied without their consent. Other burdens were imposed against their judgment and will. This evil was to be remedied. It was done by framing a Constitution which guarantees to all qualified persons the right of electing by ballot all the members of the legislative and executive departments of State; the rights and duties of each being defined and limited by the organic law. The judiciary it removes from the immediate control of popular will; and places the power of appointment in the hands of the President and Senate, the one being the highest immediate representative of the people, and the other the highest immediate representative of the States. All the rights of individuals apper-

taining to the most perfect state of civil freedom are therefore secure so long as the Constitution of the United States remains in force. If it falls, the rights of the people, North and South, fall with it. If ignored and set aside by a faction, or by intrigue, the deep, broad foundation of popular freedom is gone. Shall the Federal Constitution remain in force, or be thrown to the winds?

After the acknowledgment of American independence, the evil consisted in the sovereignty of the States. Congress was scarcely more than an advisory body. Each State could approve or disapprove, confirm or annul, congressional proceedings. It could continue in the confederacy or withdraw from it—support the league or secede. Hence the immediate danger of dissolution and anarchy. The country was in want of a principle of vitality, national union and strength. This want is met in the Constitution by forming a central Government possessing supreme authority and power over all the people, regarded as individuals and as composing States. It takes from each State the attribute of independence and sovereignty; the right of confirming or annulling the acts of Congress; all claim to the primary allegiance of its citizens; and the power of continuing its subordinate relation to the general government, or separating from it, at will. Each State is made a dependent government, limited and controlled in its three essential functions by the provisions of the Constitution. The people may frame a State Constitution, but it must be determined in the elements of its general character by the Federal Constitution which is "the *supreme law* of the land, any thing in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."* The Governor elect of a State, and the members elect of the several Legislatures, can not be inducted into office but "by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution."† No one can fill the office of Judge in a State, unless by oath or affirmation, he previously binds himself to be governed in all his decisions by "the *supreme law* of the land." If the people incorporate an ar-

* Constitution, Art. VI. Sec. 2. † Ibid. Art. VI. Sec. 3.

ticle, or section, in a State Constitution, which is inconsistent with the Supreme Law, it is *ipso facto* null and void. If a State Legislature enact a law which contravenes the Supreme Law, though it be passed unanimously, signed by the Governor, and ratified by the people, it is nevertheless null and void; because the federal Constitution is the Supreme Law for individuals and States. If the Supreme Court of a State give a decision which is at variance with the Supreme Law, though it be agreeable to the State Constitution, it is overruled and set aside by the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereby becomes null and void; for "the Judges of every State shall be bound" * by the Supreme Law, any thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Neither the people, nor any branch of the State Government, have the right to authorize an act, or pass a law, or execute any measure, unless it be conformable to the requirements of the Federal Constitution. To contravene and oppose the enactments of Congress, was a right which the people, and the States, held in the confederacy of 1781. This right was the root of evil—the source of weakness, contention and general demoralization—the cause of a process of dissolution rapidly bearing the States to the verge of destruction, from which all the thinking patriots of the day turned away appalled. The existence of this right, more than any thing else, was seen to be the curse of the land; and aroused the public mind to a deep sense of the necessity of abolishing it. To the leading minds of the day it was as clear as the sun-light, that this right must be utterly destroyed, or *it* would utterly destroy the independence and liberties of the nation. For this express purpose therefore the National Convention of 1787 was assembled; and the wisdom, learning, patriotism and piety of the land, were combined to form a Constitution and, in virtue of it, a general Government that would abolish the confederacy, destroy the independence of the States, and

* Constitution Art. VI. Sect. 2.

annihilate all States rights inhering in sovereignty; yet guarantee the unrestricted right of suffrage and representation, both to individual citizens and the States.

The House of Representatives is the immediate organ of the people, the representatives being apportioned among the several States according to the respective numbers, and chosen by a majority of legal voters. The Senate is the immediate organ of the States, two members being chosen by the Legislature of each one, irrespective of population or extent of territory. The two-fold immediate relation of the general Government to individual citizens and the States enters, thus into the structure of Congress, in which are vested all the legislative powers granted by the Constitution. From the operation of its enactments, so long as they continue in force, there is no right of appeal reserved to any State or individual.

When the Constitution was submitted to the vote of the people of the several States, the true issue assumed prominence at once. Shall we relinquish the independence of the States? This was the vital point. Shall we abolish the confederacy of sovereign States? Shall we "form a more *perfect union*?"* Shall the people establish one consolidated government, possessing authority and powers limited and defined by the organic law, but extending immediately to each individual and each State? Shall the States become each only a subordinate member of the great civil organism, possessing only such rights as are given by the Federal Constitution, or not prohibited by it? On this hinge the whole controversy of the day turned. The friends and supporters of the new Constitution were numerous and influential in every State, yet the opposition was formidable. It gathered strength just from the fact that the introduction of the new order of things would strike a death blow at the independence and sovereignty of the States. It was seen that the new Government would be such a powerful central authority, and sweep away so entirely from the States the

* Preamble of Constitution.

right to resist or nullify federal enactments, or separate at will from the union, that some of the wisest patriots of the time hesitated. In some of the States, New York for example, the result of the contest was doubtful for months. But the absolute necessity of terminating the prevailing confusion and national weakness by transforming State sovereignty into State subordination to a central Power, stared all intelligent men in the face. It could not be ignored. The vital question was discussed in all its bearings. The real issue was fairly and fully before the minds of the people. And it was met. One after another, the people of the several States adopted the new Constitution; and thus knowingly and designedly changed the entire character of the Government. They changed it in order to make each individual a citizen of the United States, and constitute the Federal Government the only sovereign* in the land.

That such was the true issue in 1787, is proved by the history of the American people during the revolutionary war and the period in which the confederation existed; by the nature of the evils which were the occasion of calling the National Convention, and demonstrated its necessity; by the character of the discussions on the floor of the Convention, pending the formation of the Constitution; by the nature of the controversy which agitated the whole country whilst the question of adoption was before the people; by the teaching of all the founders of the government, and all the accredited defenders of the Constitution from Washington, Jefferson and Madison to Jackson, Clay, Webster

* The attribute of sovereignty does not belong to a State, in any proper sense of the word. The State has authority to establish its own Government, enact its own laws, choose its own officers and administer the laws, within its limits, according to its own judgment; but the character of the State Government, of the laws enacted, and the administration of affairs, can not in any particular be contrary to the Constitution and laws of the United States. Within these limits set by the supreme authority, the State has the right to govern itself according to its own will. It is only a relative, limited and subordinate power; and bound to submit to every constitutional requirement of the general government.

and Douglas; by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States; by the administration of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, and Madison; indeed, more or less, by the administration of every President down to the present time; and by none more clearly than that of General Jackson—the most vigorous, and also the most popular, administration of the Federal Government for the last forty years.

The triumph of the Constitution gave existence to a Government in which the contrary forces of society, general authority and individual freedom, the prerogatives of the whole and the rights of single parts, are so nicely adjusted, that instead of encroaching one upon the other, they supply each one what the other demands; and thus develop consolidation and strength without working oppression; guarantee freedom without encouraging lawlessness; establish one supreme, all-embracing power, legislative, judicial and executive, without infringing the prerogatives of the States; and annihilate State independence, and with it the right of nullification or secession, without impairing the authority of the State within its legitimate sphere. Under its powerful, yet mild sway of three quarters of a century, the United States have advanced with unparallelled rapidity in agiculture, commerce, and manufactures; power, wealth and happiness; art, science and religion; and one year ago held rank, in point of population, character, influence and greatness, with the first nations on the face of the globe.

Shall this Constitution continue in force, or be destroyed by treason? Shall the Government be *the* Government which the Constitution makes it? Shall the Republic be perpetuated, or overthrown by rebellion and supplanted by despotism? This is the real issue—the life-question for the American people. It can not be ignored or evaded, but must be met and solved.

It is at bottom the old question of 1775, though presenting itself in a different form. Shall society be governed by the authority of right, or arbitrary will? Then a constitutional government transformed itself into tyranny,

against which a loyal people protested and prayed, and finally rose up, seizing the sword in defence of law and freedom; now a faction of the people, living under a Constitution framed by themselves, under laws passed by their own vote, and under an administration announced to be lawfully chosen by its own candidate for the office of President, resorts to plunder, theft, robbery and open war against a generous government, that maintains the Constitution, enforces the laws, and protects all the rights of individuals and States. The real issue is the same; but the wrong tenfold more flagrant.

It is the question of 1787 revived. Shall there be a Federal Government, or not? Shall the States be sovereign, or subordinate to the Supreme Law of the land? At that time, the Constitution was only a theory, and the Government a prospective experiment; now the Constitution has vitalized a nation of freemen, and the Government has become a most sublime reality. Then the question related to an opinion: Shall we adopt the new Constitution? Every man had a legal right to think and decide for himself. Now the question pertains to a matter of fact. Shall the established Government be perpetuated, or overthrown? Shall the many govern the few according to the Constitution, or the few govern the many in violation of the Constitution? Shall the Union be transmitted to posterity, or supplanted by a confederacy? Shall the integrity of the country be maintained, or give place to disintegration? Shall the American nation live, or die?

So soon as the electric wires bore the Proclamation of the President throughout the Republic, announcing the common danger and calling the nation to arms, millions of men and women caught the true issue of the conflict as by the inspiration of Heaven, and sent back the response in tones of thunder that shook the continent and startled the world: *The Constitution and the Union.* In sixty days, two hundred and fifty thousand men sprang into place in martial array, fully equipped to meet rebellion in arms, and eager to strike in defence of the laws—each one re-

solved, at every cost, to maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and the integrity of the Union. This is the echo of the national heart to the voice of the Chief Magistrate. A spectacle so sublime, and yet so terrible, has never before been witnessed in the history of any nation. If reason can not do it; if forbearance is taken for cowardice, and peaceful expostulation for weakness; the sword must be drawn to solve the national question; for "the powers that be" do not bear "the sword in vain." "Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation."

Let not the drawn sword be put back into its sheath until rebellion has bowed in submission to the sovereign majesty of established Law.

E. V. G.

ART. VII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPAEDIA: A popular Dictionary of General Knowledge. Edited by *George Ripley* and *Charles A. Dana*. Vol. XII. Mozambique—Parr. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1861.

Although the book trade is nearly prostrated by the civil war, the "American Cyclopaedia" seems to have suffered no interruption as yet. We have just received Vol. XII, which finishes letters M. N. and O. with a part of letter P. Having recently expressed our views on the general character and merits of this great national work, it is sufficient to say that the last Vol. is behind none of its predecessors and contains valuable biographical sketches of a number of living characters not yet represented as far as we know in any other Cyclopaedia. Among these is also the Rev. Dr. Nevin, the founder and former editor of this Review. The sketch which is fair and just, will interest our readers and may give them an idea of the biographical department of the Appleton Cyclopaedia. We take this occasion to correct a slight error in the article. Dr. Schaff's "Principle of Protestantism" was not published "in the same year" with the "Anxious Bench," as here stated, but two years later, in 1845.

"NEVIN, *John Williamson*, D. D., an American theologian, born in Franklin county, Penn'a., Feb. 20th, 1803. He was graduated at Union College, New York, in 1821, studied theology for three years in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., and continued there two years afterwards as assistant teacher in the place of Professor Hodge, then absent in Europe. During this time he wrote "Biblical Antiquities," (2 vols., 1828). He was licensed to preach by the presbytery of Carlisle in 1828. Toward the close of 1829 he was called to the Western Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in Alleghany city, where he continued as assistant teacher, and afterwards

as professor of Hebrew, and Biblical Literature, for ten years; and in the mean while he was ordained. He also edited in 1833 and 1834 "The Friend," a weekly literary journal published under the auspices of the Young Men's Society of Pittsburg and its vicinity. In 1840 he removed to Mercersburg, Penn'a., in obedience to a call from the Synod of the German Reformed Church inviting him to take charge of its Theological Seminary, in connection with Dr. F. A. Rauch, who was at the same time president of Marshall College in the same place. The death of Dr. Rauch, March 2, 1841, left him in the sole charge of the Theological Seminary and the Presidency of the College, till 1844, when Dr. Philip Schaff was called as his colleague in the Seminary. In 1843 he published "The Anxious Bench," which calls in question the propriety of certain means and measures then extensively employed in the service of religious revivals. This work furnished occasion for much controversy. It was enlarged in a subsequent edition, and also translated into German. The same year he published a translation of Dr. Schaff's "Principle of Protestantism," with an introduction, and a sermon on "Catholic Unity." In 1846 he published "The Mystical Presence," a vindication of the reformed doctrine of the holy Eucharist; in 1847, the "History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism;" in 1848, "Antichrist, or the Spirit of Sect and Schism." From Jan. 1849, to Jan. 1853, he edited the "Mercersburg Review," published by the Alumni Association of Marshall College, which is still continued, and to which he has been up to this time (1860) a prominent contributor. At the close of 1851 he resigned his situation as Professor in the Theological Seminary, continuing to act as President of Marshall College until its union with Franklin College at Lancaster, Pa., in 1853, and its subsequent removal to that place. He was offered the Presidency of the College in its new form, but declined it. He now lives in literary retirement near Lancaster. It was during Dr. Nevin's connection with the theological and literary institutions at Mercersburg, and the "Mercersburg Review," that the movement began and was carried forward which has developed itself into what is called the "Mercersburg System of Theology." Of this movement Dr. Nevin was the originator and exponent. It seemed to grow into shape without calculation or plan. It owes its existence properly not to any spirit of philosophical speculation, as has been sometimes imagined, but to an active interest in practical Christianity. Historically it may be regarded as having commenced with the publication of "The Anxious Bench" in 1843. Then came the sermon on "Church Unity," preached by Dr. Nevin at the opening of the triennial convention of the Reformed Dutch and German Reformed Churches at Harrisburg, Pa., in 1844; a discourse sanctioned by the official representatives of both Churches at the time, the positions of which, however, on the subject of the mystical union and in opposition to the sect system,

were felt by many afterwards to involve a dangerous tendency. Dr. Schaff's "Principle of Protestantism" brought out the tendency, in the apprehension of such persons, under still more alarming proportions. This was followed by the "Mystical Presence," with a translation of Dr. Ullmann's masterly tract on "The Distinctive Character of Christianity," prefixed in the form of a preliminary essay. The work was a vindication at large of the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper, conveying against the general Protestantism of the time a charge of wholesale defection from the Protestant sacramental faith of the 16th century. The tract "Antichrist" was an assault upon the sect system, as being in full antagonism to the true idea of the Church, and such a heresy as draws after it virtually in the end a Gnostic denial of the proper mystery of the incarnation itself.

As the occasions of theological discussion were thus multiplied, it was felt necessary to establish a special organ for carrying it forward; and thus originated the "Mercersburg Review," the pages of which for some years form a sort of progressive picture of the system to whose exposition and defence it has been devoted from the first. The cardinal principle of the Mercersburg system is the fact of the incarnation. This viewed not as a doctrine or speculation, but as a real transaction of God in the world, is regarded as being necessarily itself the sphere of Christianity, the sum and substance of the whole Christian redemption. Christ saves the world, not ultimately by what he teaches, or by what he does, but by what he is in the constitution of his person. His person in its relations to the world carries in it the power of victory over sin, death, and hell, the force thus of a real atonement or reconciliation between God and man, the triumph of a glorious resurrection from the dead, and all the consequences for faith, which are attributed to this in the Apostles' Creed. In the most literal sense accordingly Christ is here held to be "the way, the truth and the life," the principle of "life and immortality," the "light" of the world, its "righteousness," and its "peace." The "grace which bringeth salvation" in this view, is of course always a real effluence from the new order of existence, which has thus been called into being by the exaltation of the Word made flesh at the right hand of God. It must be supernatural as well as natural, and the organs and agencies by which it works must in the nature of the case carry with them objectively something of the same character and force.

In this way the Church is an object of faith; the presence of a new creation in the old world of nature; the body of Christ, through which as a medium and organ he reveals himself and works till the end of time. It mediates with supernatural office instrumentally between Christ and his people. Its ministers hold a divine power from him by apostolic succession. Its sacraments are not signs merely, but seals of the grace they represent. Baptism is for the remission of sins. The eucharist includes the real presence of Christ's whole glo-

rified life, in a mystery, by the power of the Holy Ghost. The idea of the Church, when it is thus held as an object of faith, involves necessarily the attributes which were always ascribed to it in the beginning, unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity. The spirit of sect, as it cleaves to Protestantism at the present time, is a very great evil, which is of itself sufficient to show that if Protestantism has any historical justification in the beginning, its mission thus far has been only half fulfilled, and that it can be rationally approved only as it is taken to be an intermediate preparation for some higher and better form of Christianity hereafter. The distinguishing character of the Mercersburg Theology, in one word, is its Christological interest, its way of looking at all things through the person of the crucified and risen Saviour. This as the world now stands, embraces necessarily all that enters into the conception of the Church question, which this system holds to be the great problem for the Christianity of the present time."

THE CHARACTER OF JESUS: Forbidding his possible Classification with Men. By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner. 1861.

This is an exact reprint of the Tenth Chapter of Dr. Bushnell's work on *Nature and the Supernatural,* noticed in a former number of this Review. It is acknowledged by all critics to be the gem of this remarkable work, and hence well worthy of a separate publication and wider circulation. It is a masterly argument for the superhuman character of Jesus of Nazareth, full of glowing thoughts and burning words. If Dr. Bushnell had never written any thing else, this alone would entitle him to a leading rank among the divines of the age.

The idea is not altogether new. Reinhard commenced this line of argument by his well known tract on the *Plan of Jesus.* Ullman followed it in his *Sinlessness of Christ.* Young added some additional features in his *Christ of History.* Our own recent tract on the *Moral Character of Christ* belongs to the same class of works. But Bushnell has freely reproduced the general idea, clothed it with the charms of his own rich genius and given it a highly eloquent and almost poetical finish. He wrote evidently for the New England latitude and in view of the skeptical tendencies there prevalent of late. He meets more especially the objections of Theodore Parker and the Unitarians generally. He, indeed, does not go far enough. His argument leads simply to the conclusion that Christ is a superhuman, but not necessarily a strictly divine person. He may

have had special reasons for stopping half way, and it may be all the better for the particular phase of unbelief he wishes to meet. He is all right as far as he goes and may accomplish a great deal of good by it. But starting from the same premises, we cannot stop short of the conclusion that the absolute perfection of Christ's humanity in the midst of a universally sinful world is the great moral miracle of history and a proof of his divinity or essential unity with the Father according to his own sublime declaration: "I and the Father are one," and according to the declaration of the skeptical Thomas freely accepted by him: "My Lord and my God."

Thus carried out the argument in question is one of the strongest internal evidences of Christianity, and appeals especially to all the honest enquirers of the present age. Christ is the Saviour of the world not so much by what he teaches, or by what he does, but first of all by what he *is* in his own divine human person. He himself is the Light of the world, the Way, the Truth and the Life, the Resurrection and the Life everlasting. His doctrine and work can only be properly understood as the necessary emanation of his person, as the light is the emanation of the sun.

This truth has been from the beginning the ruling idea in what has been styled right or wrong the Mercersburg system of theology. It starts in this view of Christ, and all its other tenets of the mystical life union with Christ, of the Church as the body of Christ, of sacramental grace, etc., are legitimate and true only as far as they develop and carry out this noble principle and tend to the glory of our heavenly Redeemer. Sound churchliness can only hold in sound Christliness. All the rest is chaff which the wind may drive away, the sooner the better. As far and as long as churchly principles are based upon this rock of ages, there can be no danger and harm in them, they can only tend to promote a healthy and vigorous practical Christianity. For true piety consists in the imitation of the life of Christ and the transformation of the whole man into his holy and heavenly image.

Mr. Scribner has given this tract a most elegant outfit, and we do no not remember ever having seen a more tasty little book of the same size. We only wish that it may find a large circulation.

P. S.

CHRISTIAN NURTURE. By Horace Bushnell. New York: Charles Scribner, 1861.

Thirteen years ago Dr. Bushnell published two discourses on the nature of Christian Nurture. The little volume was reviewed in this Quarterly by Dr. Nevin. Afterwards, these were republished with another, the fourth of the present work. Thirteen new essays, in the form of discourses, though never used as such, as the author informs us in the Preface, but written simply for the discussion's sake, are now added; and the volume, which virtually covers the ground of a treatise, takes the form of successive topical discussions, or essays, on so many themes included in the general subject.

The author grapples with a deep-rooted evil in the Christian Church of modern times—a want of faith in educational religion. In opposition to prevailing theories, he develops with easy logic, and in vigorous, flowing diction, the nature, necessity and mode of Christian nurture. The subject involves the Covenant and Baptism; the organic character of the Family; church membership of children; parental qualifications, and training; family government; and the regulations, privileges and restrictions of home-life. The handling of each topic is free, bold, profound and earnest; bringing out most wholesome and necessary truths, adapted to the present attitude, in theory and practice, of a large proportion of professing Christians.

Yet the book, timely and powerful as it is, does not meet the demand. It acknowledges the Covenant, and vindicates infant Baptism; but the one is not an objective state of grace, and the other is not the act of God translating its subject from the dominion of the curse into that state. The covenant is a promise, rather than a spiritual reality; and Baptism a token, the seal of a promise, rather than a sacrament, the medium of divine power. Infant church membership is presumptive, rather than real—a prophecy rather than a fulfillment. Grace accordingly must reach children by the Holy Ghost working in natural channels; not by the Holy Ghost in channels of His own creation—must reach them according to the organic law of human life, not according to the law of life in Christ Jesus. There is no principle of grace in the baptized child on which Christian Nurture acts; but human tuition, energized by the Spirit must beget it, the divinely instituted agency of the Holy

Ghost not being equal to the work. The child remains really in a state of nature; and Nurture is required to develop nature into grace. An impossibility.

The book moves, thus, on the low plane of nature, rather than in the sphere of the new creation; and looks to natural agencies, as means of the Spirit, to quicken the new life, rather than to the almighty grace of God working in his own ordinance. "Baptism doth also now save us" (1 Pet. 3 : 21). Assume that children occupy a position of grace in the covenant; that as many "as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ" (Gal. 3 : 27), and the argument proceeding on this principle would be sound, apposite, powerful for good, and irresistible.

E. V. G.

Elements of Moral Philosophy; analytical, synthetical, and practical. By Hubbard Winslow, author of Intellectual Philosophy. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

The value of a work on Moral Philosophy depends mainly on two things: a sound principle of moral obligation by which the science is ruled in all its parts; and a logical development of the principle in a scientific system. The work of Dr. Winslow does not profess to possess the first; for he teaches that there are *many* principles of morality; not *one* only. There is the principle of *Temperance* to regulate the *appetite* for food and drink; the principle of *Benevolence* to regulate the affections, desires and emotions; the principle of *Justice* that determines proper regard for the rights of our fellow-men. So in other respects. We have the principles of *Chastity*, of *Veracity*, *Faithfulness*, *Gratitude* and *Religion*, each regulating moral conduct in a particular relation. But *the* principle to which all others are subordinate, is not affirmed. Yet the leading idea of the book seems to be that the *right* consists in moral activity which is conformable to the law of God; and so far forth it is decidedly superior to some of the most popular works on the Science of Morality in the English language.

As regards method, it is not wanting either. There is a well-defined system pursued from beginning to end. But it is the method of the author—the plan which he has chosen to adopt; and not the method which the laws of scientific statement and discussion require. It is subjective rather than objective.

We commend the book for its deep earnestness; its reverence for religious truth; and unqualified deference to the Sacred Scriptures; yet we look in vain for the recognition of the relation which the Lord Jesus Christ bears to all Scriptural morality. And none other is worthy of the name.

E. V. G.

THE FAMILY, FARM AND GARDENS, AND THE DOMESTIC ANIMALS. In three Parts. Illustrated. Edited by E. G. Storke from the latest and best authorities. Auburn Publishing Company, Au burn, N. Y.

A practical book. It teaches how to keep house, provide, cook, preserve health, manage a household; treats of the management of the farm, kitchen-garden, fruit-garden, and flower-garden; of the domestic animals, the horse, ox, sheep, etc. A very valuable manual for the family, farmer and horticulturist. The aim of the Editor is to be useful rather than original. He has collected the most important information, from the most recent and reliable sources, and arranged it in such form as renders it at once easy of comprehension and practice, and therefore useful to the masses.

The plan of the work is good; and has been well executed.

E. V. G.

A HISTORY OF ALL NATIONS, from the earliest Periods to the Present Time: or, Universal History; in which the History of every nation, Ancient and Modern, is separately given. Illustrated by 70 Stylographic Maps, and 700 Engravings, by S. G. Goodrich. 2 vols. 8 vo.

Of the characteristics of the author of Peter Parley's works it is not necessary to speak, being favorably known, especially among the youth, by his "Tales," "Cabinet Library," "Recollections of a Life-Time," &c., &c., wherever the English Language is spoken.

The *History of all Nations* is a popular work by a popular writer. It is comprehensive in its design, rich in details, clear and compact in style, and based on extensive study and research. It is not scientific and critical; nor does it profess to be. But it aims at a faithful reproduction of the best results of historical inquiry, in a form adapted to the wants of the people in general; and in this respect the author has been eminently successful. We know of no work of this class that has superior claims to high regard.

E. V. G.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1861.

Art. I.—THE TRUE CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.*

The religion of Jesus Christ, according to its essential constitution, is life and power. Catholic in its spirit, world-embracing in design, universal in its adaptation and perpetually progressive in its nature, it is widely different from all other religions, inasmuch as its vigor and glory are ever on the increase. The superstitious productions of heathenism are ever losing their original power and splendor, evincing the truth that the fatal worm of decay is breeding in their very constitution. Mohammedanism arose from the moral shades of Arabia, and, for a few centuries, threatened, in its frantic enthusiasm, to overrun and overturn the world with the sword and cimeter; and even to eclipse Christianity itself with its transient splendor; but its subsequent regress gives evidence that its glory is ephemeral. Its decline is gradual, but certain. Already has it fallen from the semi-moral position attained by its first califfs. Diseased in the core it decays toward the circumference, making dissolution and death inevitable to the whole. The same is true of all the pagan and semi-pagan religions throughout the world. Of all the various forms of religion that the human family in their perishing condition have originated, from the lowest Feticism of Africa up to the higher grade of heathenism

* A discourse delivered before the Alumni Association of the Theological Seminary, of the German Reformed Church, Tiffin, Ohio, at its fourth annual meeting held at Delaware, Ohio, on Friday evening, May 31st, 1861, by Rev. John Swander, Pastor of Kinnikinnick Charge, Ross Co., Ohio.

among the worshippers of Jupiter, it may with equal truth be said that they possess in their constitution the elements of their own destruction. "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," is legibly written on every black temple of heathen idolatry.

It is not so with the religion of Jesus Christ. Christianity possesses an indestructible nature—an inherent principle of self-perpetuity. The burning bush can never be consumed, but will ever continue to burn brighter and brighter, rise higher and higher, until its millennial flames shall illumine the world, and mingle in the purer light of Heaven. The divine leaven once placed in the meal of humanity, is destined by its own law of assimilation to pervade and leaven the whole lamp. The mustard seed once planted in the deep soil of our fallen nature, must necessarily, by its own organic law, become a tree whose branches will lodge the fowls of heaven. The kingdom of God, though established in the dark bosom of fallen humanity, and reared amidst the raging persecutions of earth and hell, reaches toward no lower end than victory over the world and glory to God in the highest.

This difference between the tendencies of the religion of Jesus Christ and of the false religions of the world, grows out of their very constitution. Christianity is a vital system. It is a system in as much as it unfolds and forms itself from a principle within. It is a vital system, because the principle from which it unfolds itself is emphatically one of life and power. All other religions are not strictly systems, but collections of forms and fancies held together by mechanical force. Buddhism is an incoherent frame-work, with no living ligaments to bind it organically, or no life-principle to vitalize and systemize its parts. Hence its tendency is to decay. No other destiny, indeed, awaits it. The same is true of all the religions of human origin. On the other hand, Christianity, being a vital system, having its source and centre in its divine-human Author, must by a law of growth peculiar to itself, unfold its inner life, giving vitality, pro-

portion and beauty to all the parts, until, as the tree of life, it is ready to be transplanted from the soil of earth, to flourish in the atmosphere of heaven.

With these preliminary remarks, I proceed more particularly to discuss the following theme: *The true conception of Christianity organically developed from the glorious mystery of the Incarnation, as apprehended in the light of true faith.*

Christianity, as a mysterious vitalizing system, has for its source and centre the Incarnation of the Son of God—"the entrance and everlasting dwelling of the Eternal Word in the organism of humanity." The Word made flesh is the great fundamental truth of godliness. Here all the lines of redeeming wisdom, love and justice meet.—From this central standpoint alone can the angels shout their celestial anthem:—"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." Around this mystery the whole redemptive scheme revolves, deriving therefrom its vitality, symmetry, and perpetuity. With a sustaining and controlling centre like this the Psalmist may well have said, "Thy Kingdom, O Lord, is an everlasting kingdom."

If Christianity, then, has such a real living centre from which it is unfolded, it must have a real existence of its own. If the seed be real, the plant, into whose organism the life of the seed enters, must be equally so. Christianity holds its existence in union with Christ's person and work and can never be separated therefrom. It is, however, not absolutely one with Christ. Christ is not the new creation, but the principle of it. The new creation is in Him. As such it is not a creation in human thought; not an empty theory, but a real objective fact; mysterious, but not magical; supernatural, but not unnatural. The Christian religion, by virtue of its vital relation to Christ, combines in itself "substantive elements of being," making it an objective reality in the world. Faith cannot create Christianity; and unbelief can not destroy it. By faith we may have access into grace, but faith can not bring such grace into existence any more than the feeble organ of

sight can create the radiant beams of the meridian sun and call them down from above. The sun *is* and shines, whether we have eyes to enjoy its light or not. The mustard tree *is* a tree, whether the fowls of the air lodge on its branches, or fly over them. Religion does not rest upon human experience for its foundation, but true Christian experience and everything else that belongs to religion must rest upon the living basis of "grace and truth" in the person and work of Christ—grace for man in his unworthiness, and truth for man in moral blindness. "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

This fulness of grace and truth in Jesus Christ is very appropriately called by theologians, a kingdom of grace. This it is by virtue of its mission in the world, which is one of grace. Man is sinful and unworthy; hence any interposition on the part of God in his behalf must reach him in the form of grace. The inspired writers, while using several synonymous terms, have interchangeably denominated it the "kingdom of God" and "kingdom of heaven." It is called the kingdom of God in contradistinction from the kingdom of Satan, as well as, from the fact that upon its throne God Himself is seated as the King immortal, invisible and full of glory. It is called the kingdom of heaven as contradistinguished from the kingdoms of the world, and also because it comes to us replete with heavenly powers. It is the kingdom of heaven, inasmuch as it descends from above filled with spiritual forces and resources, which are not the product of the powers of earth, and do not belong to the constitution of this world.

But the kingdom of heaven can reach its true actualization on earth, only as it enters into and pervades the kingdom of humanity. It can never be perpetuated as a mere abstraction. God must come down and unite fallen humanity personally with Himself before it can arise. Grace must descend before nature can ascend. Whe Word must be made flesh: otherwise there would be no point of contact between the divine and human—grace and nature; and no room in the House of David for such a fountain of

grace and truth to be opened. The kingdom of God can elevate and benefit the fallen disordered kingdom of human nature, only as the power which comes from above enters into its bosom and pervades its very life. Viewed in this light the kingdom of heaven is emphatically a kingdom of grace. It could not be otherwise. If grace be unmerited favor bestowed upon an unworthy creature, it follows of necessity that the fountain opened to the House of David, by the Incarnation of the Eternal Word is a fountain of grace and truth.

This kingdom of God is at hand. It is actually established in the world. The Eternal Word was made flesh, that the Incarnate Word might truthfully say: "Lo I am with you alway." God's kingdom is not an absent economy of grace that human prayers or efforts bring to hand, but it is here, looking the helpless guilty world in the face, earnestly striving to convince it of sin, of righteousness and of a judgment to come. It is here by the Incarnation and outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, as well as by His ever abiding presence, in the Church, in fulfillment of the faithful promise of Christ, "I will pray the Father and he will give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth, whom the world can not receive." The kingdom of God is here in order to carry out and accomplish its heavenly mission of leavening the whole lump of humanity on earth, preparing its submissive subjects for the kingdom of glory.

It is the presence of God's gracious kingdom in the world that makes it possible for us to have access into it. "Repent, *for* the kingdom of God *is at hand;*" challenging our repentance. Otherwise we could not repent. Believe, for the kingdom of God is at hand, challenging our faith. Otherwise we could not believe; if we could, faith could never give us access into an absent kingdom of grace. "Faith is the evidence of things not seen," rather than the evidence of things not present. Faith does not first "ascend into heaven to bring Christ down from above," or "descend into the deep to bring Christ again from the dead;" neither

does it go out into the wide world beyond the proper sphere of Divine mediation to bring the kingdom of God within reach before its powers are brought to bear upon the soul; but it is the ever abiding presence of this kingdom, replete with supernatual powers, that calls forth faith in us to lay hold of the wonderful mystery—the Word made flesh dwelling among us full of grace and truth, in order to make it possible for us to "have access into this grace wherein we stand." The truth of this is placed beyond all consistent controversy by our Saviour's parable of the leaven. The leaven pervades and assimilates the meal by its own mysterious power. The meal has no potency whatever, wherewith to pervade the leaven, or to bring it within reach. So is the kingdom of God. Jesus Christ in whom is the fulness of grace and truth, still says to a powerless humanity, as he said to the paralytic of old, "Stretch forth thy hand," when the word of command mysteriously conveys the power to obey.

This grace and truth, however, do not flow from Christ in an abstract, or gnostic, manner to convict, regenerate, convert, and sanctify abnormal humanity, but through the organs, or means, divinely ordained by infinite wisdom for that purpose. Here appears to view the true idea of the Church in its relation both to Christianity and humanity. The kingdom of grace and truth, while it has its fontal spring in the person of Christ, is present in the world unfolding itself historically in the form of the Holy Catholic Church, His body and fulness. It pleased the Father, not only that in Him should all fulness dwell, but also that the Church should be His fulness. (Eph. 1 : 23). The grace in which the believer stands is emphatically the grace of Jesus Christ; but this grace flows and circulates in the Church, the body of Christ. As really as the vivific blood flows from the heart through the arterial channels to vitalize the members of the natural body, does the quickening grace and truth in which we stand, circulate through the sacramental channels divinely ordained in the Church, to vitalize and nourish the members of Christ's mystical body.

This is so, not on account of any arbitrary arrangement of Divine Providence, but from an internal necessity. The tree necessitates the growth of fruit from a life power within; so the Incarnation, as it brings a fountain of grace and truth into the world, necessitates an institution just like the Church to bear that grace and truth, and bring its leavening power into connection with the whole mass of unregenerated humanity. In no other way can it be thoroughly permeated—the whole lump leavened. We repeat, therefore, that the Church, as the body of Christ, is essentially the embodiment of the incarnate mystery, the organ of its historical development and the living form of its perpetuity in the world. Otherwise the Incarnation would have no vital significance whatever, in its relation to our fallen race; and could never bear its ultimate fruit, which is glory to God in the highest through the regeneration, sanctification and complete redemption of fallen man. Viewed in this light, it may with scriptural consistency be claimed, that the Church is the woman who takes the leaven of grace and truth, and places it in the meal of unsanctified humanity. In this sense has it been truthfully said, that the Church is the Bride bearing the lamp of truth in her hands and the oil of gace in her sacramental vessels, going forth through the world's moral darkness, with the gracious salutation and imperative command: "Behold the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him." In this light do the Scriptures denominate the Church the Bride, and the Lamb's wife by the everlasting bands of living wedlock. In this sense, and in no other, is the Jerusalem which is from above the mother of us all. Otherwise believers are not legitimate children of Christ, "the Everlasting Father," and have no well grounded claims to the inheritance of the saints in light, which is incorruptible, undefiled and fadeth not away.

It is obvious, then, that the Incarnation, as regards salvation, becomes operative only in the bosom of the Church as the proper channel of its continuation. To take any other arbitrary, abstract view of it, would be to rob the

great mystery of godliness of its true contents, and resolve the person and work of Christ into a mere outward occasion by which omnipotence proposes to save believers. With such a mechanical Christology, or Churchology, the cross would have no attraction, the pulpit no power, the sermon no soul, the sacraments no sign or seal, the ministry no meaning, and the Holy Catholic Church no mission to perform, but what might be performed just as well by a temperance society or a pious legislative body.

From what has been said, it is evident that Christianity, in its very conception, is a supernatural fact. It is not a mere object of observation or feeling; neither is it a gnostic apparition, but a new creation in the highest sphere of reality—above the sphere of sense and reason. If the Incarnation be a mystery, the Church, into whose bosom the perpetuated force of the Incarnation flows and makes itself operative, must be a mystery also. The kingdom of grace does not start in a mystery soon to become an object of sense, but remains a mystery through every stage of its development as regards its relation to the world of sense, "the mystery which has been hid from ages and from generations." In a word, Christianity, starting in the supernatural union of the Divine and human in the Person of Christ, is a supernatural constitution, filled with supernatural powers and resources, and in its own supernatural way is destined to bring about supernatural results.

As the great mystery of godliness, Christianity can therefore become intelligible only to true faith. It can be apprehended by no other power. It baffles the widest range, highest flight and most gigantic grasp of unregenerated reason, as well as all other merely natural and abnormal powers of the soul. "We have access by faith into this grace." Faith alone can lead us to the Holy of Holies, and conduct us into the inner court of the "true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man." Without such faith, we can never pass beyond the outer courts of the New Testament Sanctuary, where the New Testament Shechinah is never displayed in awful majesty By faith we not only

"understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God," but also that the same Eternal Word which was in the beginning with God, by His Incarnation laid the foundation of a superstructure more grand, and a creation more sublime, than the physical universe with all its stars and planets—the Temple of human redemption in his own Person.

Christian faith, however, to answer its true idea and subserve its true end, must be full, and possess its proper contents in their proper form. It must not only grasp the truth that "The Word was made flesh," but that He, in the assumption of humanity, established a fountain of grace and truth, and continues to dwell among us by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the bosom of the Church, where the central stream of historical Christianity flows onward to the end of time. To admit the first and deny the second is virtually to deny "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." "This is that spirit of anti-Christ, whereof ye ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world" resolving the whole mystery of the Incarnation into a mere transient theophany. The Holy Catholic Church is a necessary part of one general mystery of faith. To profess a belief in Christ and deny to the Church this essential position, as the connecting link in the Christian Creed, is to mar the organic completeness of the whole; and force faith to feed upon its own vitals. Or, to make the Church an object of faith in an outward, adventitious sense, and resolve it into a mere sand-heap of good men and women, collected together for the sake of convenience and held together by outward force, and consequently to give the Holy sacraments no objective efficacy, is to rob faith of its proper nourishment and starve it to death on its own meagre subjectivity. Our faith, to be healthy and full, must take up, as its necessary contents, all of those nourishing truths that enter into the great mystery of godliness, from the article "God the Father, Almighty Maker of Heaven and Earth," through every organic link of the Holy Apostolic Creed to its glorious consummation in the

article "Life everlasting," in which the "Word made flesh" reaches the ultimate consummation, and bears its ripest fruit. Christian faith, to serve its true purpose, must see "God" in "Jesus Christ," reconciling the world unto Himself, by the "Holy Ghost," in the "Holy Catholic Church," which is Christ's body, in which we are united in the closest "communion of saints," as members of each other and of Him from whom we receive full "forgiveness of sins," as well as that life which is the ground of "the resurrection of the body" and "the life everlasting."

And now, Fellow Alumni, while we go forth as "ambassadors of Christ," to negotiate the treaty of peace between God and man, we can not be too deeply impressed with the truth, that Christianity has an objective existence in the world, and that all its parts are organically related to each other. Although Christ's kingdom is not *of* the world it is, nevertheles, *in* the world and *for* the world; not as an abstraction of the carnal fancy, but a heavenly power in organic union with the life of the world as it culminates in the life of man. This truth is more prominent than any other in all of Christ's most instructive parables. He never used a mechanical figure to teach the nature of his spiritual kingdom. The mustard tree, the leaven in the meal, the seed sown in the ground and the vine in its relation to the branches were selected by the great Preacher from the world of nature, as suitable figures, to represent corresponding truths in the organic world of grace.

It is evident from the writings of the Apostles, that they saw the force and beauty of these parables. John knew no such thing as the "Word made flesh" to serve as a mere occasion of consistency in the purposes of God toward human redemption. The idea that the Son of God took a human body merely to make it possible for Him to teach, suffer and die, was to Him a heresy as hideous as the spirit of antichrist. St. John knew of no transient theanthropic phantom passing, like a comet, along the dark horizon of fallen humanity without affecting it beyond the individual person of Jesus. Nay verily! He had a nobler

christology than that. With his eagle eye he saw a new principle of life and light—"grace and truth"—introduced, with permanent force, into the innermost sanctuary of human life, to run parallel with and counteract the work of darkness and death which entered it in the fall of Adam. The same doctrine was well understood by St. Paul, and continually made prominent in his most logical teachings. For him it was the faithful saying worthy of all acceptation. St. Peter, too, was far from being an abstractarian. His faith was not satisfied until it could transcend the limits of nature, so as to see and acknowledge in the person of Christ the fountain of grace and truth, that was to be opened to the House of David. This faith led him to that free and notable confession, "Thou are the Christ, the Son of the living God," as he beheld, behind the mantle of the natural, the mystery of the supernatural.

In fact the deepest meaning and ruling animus of the New Testament, throughout is that the new creation in Christ Jesus is not a mere *plan* drawn out by the wisdom of Jehovah—not a mere *theory* holding its existence in the Divine mind—not a mere *diagram* to be filled up with subjective faith, experience, good feeling and common sense, but a *real objective creation*, starting from and centering in the person and work of Christ, of permanent force in the world, moving majestically down the central current of human history, holding its existence in the Church, "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, God might gather together in one all things in Christ" (Eph. 1. 10).

The ancient Church Fathers, too, had a Christology very different from the popular Christianized Gnosticism, or Nesterianism, of modern times. Ignatius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyprian and Athanasius would had starved their faith to death on the meagre diet of abstractions that seem to satisfy the modern religious appetite. A prevailing consciousness of the presence of a supernatural kingdom of grace, filled whith heavenly powers, ruled the whole development of primitive theology, and fired the faith of those venerable fathers, whose immortal foot-prints can

never be obliterated from the theological sands of time. Could the council of Ephesus again be convoked, and those venerable heroes of primitive faith re-called to defend the standard of orthodox Christology, if possible their sainted dust would speak, and with a voice of sacred thunder proclaim it into the ears of "Anti-Creed Heresy:" *What God has joined together, let no man put asunder.*

When we survey the vast field of theological sentiment, in this modern age of quackery both in Church and State, in its ever increasing variety of eccentric tendencies and incentric pretensions, and bring it before the tribunal of Church History, there to test its claims to orthodoxy and Catholicity by the united wisdom and deepest piety of the past, speaking through the ancient symbols of faith as the proper historic standard of truth, we see enough, indeed, to give rise to the serious question: "Can these dry bones live?" No wonder that a large amount of modern theology is nothing more, or nothing better, than a cold intellectualism, or sickly sentimentalism, when it fails to recognize, in its proper form, the great cardinal truth that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." It is, after all, not very surprising that the Holy Sacraments are shorn of their most vital significance, when it is but the legitimate fruit of a false christology. We can easily conceive how Baptism has been resolved into a mere *modus operandi* for naming children, or an empty outward sign of regenerating grace communicated in some other way, when the system lays no claim, and, indeed, has no right to lay any claim whatever to sacramental grace to give the Institution any objective force. No wonder that the Lord's Supper has fallen to a level with the significance of a Fourth of July celebration, and the "anxious bench system" elevated high enough to remove Christ from the meditorial throne, when the doctrine that *Christianity is a historical constitution of life and power* is frowned down as a relic of Popery, or a modern innovation. Neither is it surprising that ultra Protestantism is unable to shield herself from the tantalism of Popery on the one hand, and repel the assaults of Infidelity

on the other, when she herself makes sanctimonious merit of the grossest infidelity toward the "Credo" of her own life.

Fellow Alumni, we can not adhere too strictly to the sound Christological teachings of our Seminary. A sound Christology must be the basis of all sound preaching; and only as we entertain correct views of the Incarnation and its essential relation to the Church, will we be able to apprehend the true meaning and feel the binding power of the ministerial office, and the sacramental nature of all our official ministrations. Let us be fully indoctrinated here, and the epithets "*low church*" and "*high church*" will be forever blotted from our theological vocabulary. Let us be thoroughly indoctrinated here, and we will have no occasion to resort every week to the vast literary charnel house of practical theology for dead material to manufacture dead sermons, to be rattled in the ears of a dead humanity around us. We will rest satisfied with nothing less than an organic body of Divinity filled with the presence of Christ; and as we look a helpless, guilty world in the face, striving to convince it of sin, of righteousness and of a judgment to come, the core of our preaching will be, "Repent, *for* the kingdom of God *is at hand.*" This position we must occupy and unitedly maintain, if we would perform our ministerial labors from the Christian standpoint, "the truth as it is in Jesus."

We have a specific mission to fulfill as ministers of a distinct branch of the Church, as well as a work in common with all true ambassadors of Christ in advancing the general interests of the Redeemer's kingdom. While we are a branch of the true Christian Church, occupying an orthodox doctrinal position with reference to the fundamental truths of Christianity, we nevertheless possess a denominational genius of our own. If we have nothing peculiar in doctrine or practice, we are justly chargable with inconsistency in claiming to be a denomination, and the baseless fabric of our denominationality must soon give way. But we *have* a denominational genius—a specific

life of our own. This is obvious to all who are thoroughly acquainted with our history. A peculiar spirit pervades our venerable symbol of faith, the Heidelberg Catechism, as well as all our legitimate literature; and did it pervade more generally our ministry and membership, its moulding influence would be greater, and the Reformed Church would advance with more rapid strides toward the fulfillment of her glorious mission.

Our mission, in particular, is to unfold our inner church-life. Each plant, to remain true to itself and fulfill its mission, must develop its own specific life; and we, to remain true to ourselves and accomplish our mission, must develop our inner life. In proportion as we do this, will we accomplish the more general purposes of Providence in the salvation of souls. In proportion as we fail to do this, will we paralyze our powers, weaken our efforts and circumscribe our influence for good. Our specific life, however, can be truly unfolded, only as we give it full freedom to take its own specific form. This we can do only as we remain true to our excellent symbol of faith, and make all our practical operations, throughout the whole Church, harmonize with our doctrinal position. In too many cases our practice has been but the arbitrary reduction of foreign theories—such as never grew spontaneously out of our denominational life, and can never enter consistently into it.

And we, Fellow Alumni, can do much toward the promotion of a full and healthy development of the Reformed life and genius in the Western Church. Our relation both to the Church and Seminary renders it possible to exert a powerful influence for good. While we are spiritual children of the Church, we also cherish filial affection toward our beloved *Alma Mater*, where our doctrines are taught in their purity and symmetrical beauty. This relation to both makes us the living link between them. Occupying this position, we may, without the least degree of arrogance, name ourselves the self-conscious balance-wheel that keeps the Church and Seminary in har-

monious operation. To do this effectually, let us not only drink deep from the quickening fountain of grace and truth, but also from the flowing stream of church-life, whose pure waters sparkled beneath the Sun of the Reformation when it first tinged the horizon of Switzerland. Let us be in reality what we are in name—*Reformed.* He only is a Jew who is one inwardly; and he only is a *bona fide* minister of the Reformed Church, whose soul is filled with her life. Let us never hide our sacred principles under the broad folds of prevailing sentiment; and shout Hosanna with an enthusiastic multitude, because popularity leads the way to apparent success. Let us never conceal the truth because it has its opponents who must be confronted. Nay! let us constantly endeavor to bring out more fearlessly and prominently those great principles which enter into the constitution of the Christian religion, as they are unfolded and defended in our excellent symbol of faith. Let us stand by our ancient land-marks, move in our own atmosphere and wield the weapons of truth in the spirit of love; and in doing this, let us see to it that we are found faithful; and God will assuredly crown our labors with abundant success. Fidelity to principle is the only road to a legitimate victory.

Then let us faithfully, unitedly and perseveringly labor. To be faithful and consistent stewards of the mysteries of God is a solemn and important work at any time, and under all circumstances, but more especially so in this age and country of ecclesiastical degeneracy. Church historians speak of the golden ages of faith, but we live in the brazen-faced age of "isms," surrounded by swarms of sects and schismatic societies that cannot endure sound doctrine. Ancient heresies revived, confront us on every side, and meet us in every form; only made the more dangerous by being baptized in the Christian name. Nestorianism, notwithstanding the condemnatory ordinance at Ephesus, is still in the Church, placing its skeleton impress upon the most popular theological literature of the nineteenth century; and even dares to lay its sacrilegious hand upon the

sacrament of the holy altar, putting asunder what God has joined together. Infidelity gets cunning as it grows older; the mildest forms are the most fatal in their consequences. Rationalism and naturalism are striving to drag the glorious mystery of godliness down from its own proper sphere, so that feeling and fancy may take the place of faith. Many other heresies, disguised in the cloak of self-styled evangelism, are "going to and fro in the earth," saying: "Lo! here is Christ!" when their actual fellowship is with Belial. These we must meet and overcome in the strength of Divine grace, as well as, "feed the flock of God."

How great the work before us! How important our mission! How solemn our responsibility! And if faithful to our trust, how honorable will be our achievements, and glorious our reward! In ten years, or twenty at most, we will be called upon, under the Great Head of the Church, to administer the affairs of our Western Zion. Our fathers in the ministry, who have borne the burden in the heat of the day, are entering, one after another, into their eternal rest. Their mantle will fall on our shoulders, and we must wear it. Let us not, in the spirit of vain ambition, attempt to wrest it from them, but hold ourselves in readiness to wear it after these venerable Elijahs have been taken up into heaven. Soon, ah! soon will they be called to smite the waters of Jordan, and pass over and up to the heavenly inheritance.

Then let us be fully sensible of our momentous work, and by the grace of God, our Heavenly Father, let us try to perform it. Let us stand up like an undivided band of brothers, and move forward in one unbroken phalanx, bound together by the bonds of a common Christian fraternity, and animated by a common spiritual and theological life. Thus will we be able to bear our humble part in swelling the tide of declarative glory as it rolls back toward the throne of God; and hold ourselves in readiness to hail with rapturous joy the auspicious morn, when the inherent power of the Christian religion will rear its towering steeples above the dark domes of moral night; when

this vast wilderness of unsanctified humanity around us shall blossom as the rose; and the kingdom of grace and truth in Jesus Christ and His Church, shall be more clearly apprehended, more freely and fully acknowledged, and more implicitly obeyed from the river to the ends of the earth.

ART. II.—THE PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT:* THE OLDEST AND WORTHIEST POPULAR ORATORS.

In our day, when the cold calculation of a spirit that tends outwardly, more and more threatens to suppress quiet contemplation and holy elevation of soul, the meaning and essence of the revealed word have been so much discussed already, that, in more profound minds, which care nothing for earthly gain, the all too much elaborated stuff begins to create a surfeit. For whoever, in the maze of opinions, knows how to look without prejudice to the bottom of such as boast themselves to be enlighteners of the times, will soon discover how strong is the contrast between the glittering rhetoric of the latest prophets, and the elevated simplicity of the oldest. The latter are driven by the Spirit of God; the former often by their own. May it please them, the true representatives of the people of God, the protectors and defenders of the old covenant, from the serene and quiet elevation in which they have so long enjoyed the reward of their undying words and deeds, to descend to us on the field of contest, the field enveloped in obscurity and shaken by storms.

---

* This admirable address of the late Dr. Umbreit appeared first in the "Theological Studien and Kritiken" of 1833; then again "in a form both abridged and enlarged" as the introduction to his practical commentary on the prophets. It may well find a place here as a souvenir of that learned teacher who departed the past year. [Note of the *Kirchenfreund*, from whose reprint the above is translated.]

Let Isaiah step out in advance as leader and prince of the prophets. If not sprung from a royal race, as an old tradition asserts, he is yet adorned above every one, with the crown of more majestic, not to say more divine eloquence: as it were radiant with beams of the Holy Ghost; with a deep-toned yet moderate eloquence, whose thundering words sound like the cedars of Lebanon shaken by storms; whose comforting words sparkle with lovely sereneness, like the blooming vale of Damascus, when the sun of spring shines upon it. Jeremiah follows, inferior to Isaiah indeed in beauty of form, but penetrated with no less fire, while he moves wondrously the souls of all by indescribable power in the tones of his lament, which flows forth from a deep, full and free heart. As third appears Ezekiel, of whom it may be said, he does not walk hither, but mounts upward, borne by a chariot of blinding gleams from sun and moon and stars of heaven. In fertility and in the art of producing symbolical representations he is the richest of the prophets; in the mass of truth he announces, he is weighty and powerful.

After this trio come the minor prophets, so called in respect to the amount of their prophecies. They are in part not inferior to the former in great gifts of eloquence. Hosea leads the train with an impetuous spirit of deepest sorrow over the resistless corruption of the times; yet one that, deep-rooted in firmest faith in the truth of the living God, is powerfully borne up on the stormy waves, that dash and resound in his words. He is the most difficult of all the prophets, by reason of the rapidity and proverbial style of his address; he is unique in his invention of comparisons and delights in a certain obscurity. After him appears Joel, the most spiritual herald of messianic times, richly gifted with a talent for forming new images, painting with the brightest colors; excelled by none in animated representation, excelling all in clearness of statement. Then comes Amos, the shepherd, brought up on heavenly air in the pastures, taught by nature herself in meditative eloquence. He is simple and pure in tone, varied and great

in simile, skilful in the use of images and proverbs, while he declares boldly to every man's face the will of God. Then Obadiah, who speaks only in laconics, yet darts with accuracy sharp arrows of the word from a soul on fire with holy indignation. Then Micah, holding a middle place between Isaiah and Hosea, resembling the former in greatness of mind, the latter in obscurity of expression. After him appears Nahum, depicting in the most burning colors the fall of proud Nineveh, heaping image on image, compressed and pointed. Then Habakkuk, distinguished by vigorous carriage and beautiful movement, shining gloriously in imagery; always admired as a master in sacred painting in his description of the divine majesty. Then Zephaniah, the clear herald of the universal worship of God on earth by the people of a pure language. Though he often speaks in similes and expressions of preceding prophets, he yet draws also from his own treasure. Finally Haggai, Zachariah and Malachi bring up the rear. They are slow of step and in appearance aged, but because of the joyful message they bring, they can never be enough admired as spokesmen of the Lord.

But there move in this procession also nameless ones, yet mighty apparitions of the deepest and inmost inscription of the Spirit. And among them, outshining all in the light of the New Jerusalem, is that herald of joy who announces to the captive Israelites in Chaldea the return to the land of promise. (Vid. Isa. 40–66.)

While the holy band of the prophets pass before our eyes, the question presses itself upon us; what is it then, that with all the strongly marked individuality of each, is yet common to all, and by which, united into one whole, indicated by one name, they form only one body? They themselves with one voice give the answer:—the Spirit of God.

If we pass through the high portal of the venerable temple of the old covenant, where, in the deeply significant imagery and mighty words, we become sensibly impressed with the praise of God, with whom is the fountain of life

and in whose light we see light, (Ps. 36: 10,) then there seizes on us, with its most original efficacy in the sacred twilight of the world's creation, the moving of that Spirit, which rose creative over the waters. But we do not merely feel the breath of the living and eternal God, we hear also the creative word of his mouth, "let there be" and "there was;" the plainest attestation of the conscious knowing and willing of the Almighty Being. And wherever we turn in the great and rich revelation of the Maker of heaven and earth, every where, in the onflowing stream of that resistless power that ever renews the face of the earth (Ps. 104: 30), there moves about us the Spirit that breathed the stars of heaven, and there sounds around us the Word that bound up the waters of the deep and as Wisdom formed the the beauty of the world. (Prov. 8: 27.) But it is one holy Spirit, one holy Word and one holy Wisdom that announces itself to us on every page of the Old Testament. The God who, as the Living, blessed in Noah the human race so that it should not again be flooded from the face of the ground, who as the Almighty made a covenant with Abraham and his seed in order to glorify himself in him and through him, in the whole earth, did not only say to Moses, to whom he appeared as the Ancient one of his fathers, "I am that I am," the Eternal, Jehovah; he also, at the time he renewed that covenant to the salvation of Israel amid Sanai's thundering and lightning and established it forever by his law, attested himself above all to be the Holy One, with these highly significant words: "Ye shall be holy, for I the LORD your God am holy." (Lev. 19: 2).

That is the admirable foundation and corner stone, on which rests the divine state unto the sanctification of the people: on it stands firm the seer and high priest, Samuel; on it rise those grand forms, which, historically nourished and formed by the chief doctrine of the ten commands written by the finger of God, are of one Spirit, one Word and one Wisdom.

But the living successors of Moses did not learn the law

by rote. They were no Pharisees and Scribes, that ever carried about on their lips passages from the Thora. The Spirit of God created in them anew the eternal truth, and morally luminous with its brightness, they proclaim it in his word and teach it in his wisdom. Impelled by this Spirit, and with the elevating consciousness of divine dignity, they bring, both in allegorical visions and in plain language, true freedom to the people to whom they are sent, which springs from a true faith in God, the One, the Eternal and the Holy. For such a freedom they battle and suffer and die as the servants of God.

"If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established" (Isa. 7 : 9), is the motto of the great Isaiah ; and on this memorable foundation is built the whole system of prophetical wisdom and rhetoric. The former is as simple as the latter, and the true prophet needs no bright rhetorical flowers to delight the eyes of the people and to charm their ears.

"God is the truth, the life and the eternal king," says Jeremiah (ch. 10 : 10) and the exalted seer gives proof of his close connection with such a God by his unadorned words of truth, of life and eternal authority. Never does there escape one sound of flattery from those lips dedicated by God to inviolable truth ; but with an iron staff of unbending righteousness, the castigating orator humbles the hypocritical spirit of the people, which, in the incense of an outward worship, brought only self-complacent offerings to its own pride. None of those that departed from the law of Jehovah, and profaned the Holy One of Israel by deeds of faithlessness, is spared by the zealous man of God, "Whose mouth the Lord made fire and the people wood to burn." [Jer. 5 : 14.) He whom the Lord "made a defenced city, and brazen walls against the whole land, against the kings of Judah, and against the princes thereof, against the priests thereof and against the people of the land" (Jer. 1 : 18), with unterrified greatness, is influenced by no respect of persons.

Would you, who are unsatisfied with the empty forms of

exhausted and dried up compend-wisdom (*Begriffsweisheit*), would you know from a lively and deep experience what true faith is? Then plunge into the sacred flow of prophecy. There, as our Luther expresses himself, who, in his own life, demonstrated its operation, and more than any other caught up the organ tones of the prophets, there you will not find it "as a human thought that I could form myself," but "as a divine power in the heart, by which we are born again." Yet this faith, whose wondrous outflowing you trace when you come near these great men of faith, is no obscure power, no uncertain feeling; but as Luther says again, "a divine light and life in the heart." With all the power of thought and will, this power of faith in the prophets embraces "*the rock of the heart*," as Asaph so truly and beautifully calls God, when become firm and deep-seated in the soul, (Ps. 73: 26) and does not let him go in life or in death.

Do you call the prophets poets in the common meaning of that term? Then you are wrong. For they do not wish only to enjoy sweet inspiration, and with its free and lovely fruits to refresh the spirits of others. They labor in the sweat of their brows to be teachers of their people, that will discipline, comfort and reform them. But do you, as you ought, understand by poets, living creators of inspired works of beauty? Then truly are the prophets the greatest poets of faith, and heaven and earth minister to their sacred inspiration. The stars at their bidding bow themselves to the honor of God, and forest and field, the roaring sea and the shining gold of the deep, all lend their splendor to their language. Artists too are the prophets, painters and architects in the grandest style. They dip their pencil in the rainbow-colors of divine grace, and build with stones quarried from the Rock of Israel. But they always paint and build with the living Word, musicians in the most sacred and noble sense. Therefore will the paintings of an Ezekiel never fade, and the temple of this master architect live forever.

And ye modern disciples of knowledge, do not look with

contempt from your elevation upon the prophets as servants of faith. For they appear also as masters of thoughts, and their faith was the most certain knowledge. The God indeed who spoke in them, that is however, according to your opinion, only in reality thought in them, was also out of them, a self-conscious, holy Being, whose throne is heaven and whose footstool is earth, and before whom the mightiest heroes of faith and reason kneeled. Learn, above all, humility from them. Look at that Isaiah, who only then would preach boldly to king Ahaz his God and his faith, after, as a contrite sinner, he had bowed before the holiest of all and received the consecration of his unclean lips by the heavenly fire of the seraph.

Meekness and obedience, those eternal pillars of the welfare of nations, those virtues of men born to be glorified through suffering, which can never be enough lauded,—they form the deeply stirring refrain of that mighty music of sacred eloquence which we hear on the steps of the throne, at the threshhold of the temple and in the market and streets. Hear what the mouth of Isaiah announces with impressive truth: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. And they shall pass through it, hardly bestead and hungry: and it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God, and look upward. And they shall look unto the earth; and behold trouble and darkness, dimness of anguish; and they shall be driven to darkness." (Isa. 8, 20–22.) And how the fires of holy indignation gleam in the lamentations of the magnanimous Jeremiah, as his look falls on the deceivers of his time, who boasted of the people's health, whereas they were sick and wretched. "How do ye say we are wise, and the law of the LORD is with us? Lo, certainly in vain made he it; the pen of the scribes is in vain. The wise men are ashamed, they are dismayed and taken: lo, they have rejected the word of the LORD: and what wisdom is in them." (Jer. 8: 8–11.)

Just this is the great lesson that all these oldest orators of the people preach to every age: that the wisdom of the world, though delivered in the most brilliant form of words, only leads into deserts, where every spring of life sinks away, if once men reject the word of God, i. e., the sacred truth. "But they have ears and they hear not; they have eyes and see not." What trace do you find of that heavenly wisdom of old prophecy in the so often lauded addresses of the heroes of ecclesiastical or political eloquence? What spirit is it that fires them? Is it the almighty breath that shakes the cedars of Lebonon and the oaks of Bashan? It is a vain and petty worldly spirit; earthly arrogance and ambition, now showing itself in naked boldness, now veiled in the borrowed brightness of deceitful wisdom. By two words you can distinguish the true prophets. It is when with unsparing earnestness they lay open your *sins*, let them lie never so deep and be most artfully hid; and then promise *grace* to the bowed soul for consolation.

"Come now, and let us reason together, saith the LORD: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." (Isa. 1: 18.)

Though everywhere in the Old Testament the dark words about sin are written plainly enough for the eye that will see,—for David, the most pious king, bore witness to it in his sufferings and in his songs, and Solomon, the wisest, confessed it in his life and teaching;—yet as men refuse to read it in themselves, so too it will remain hidden to them in the records of the oldest revelation, though that has for a chief object the design to awaken the consciousness of the wide-reaching corruption of our nature, that men may clearly understand it and be heartily sorry for it. And it is just the prophets, who, in their admonitions, the clearest impress of divine truth, hold before their people the truest mirror, in which to see their own hateful nakedness.

But Jeremiah testifies: "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked: who can know it?" (Ch.

17 : 9.) And so men would gladly persuade themselves that the All-righteous had, by his ambassadors, suspended the scourge of discipline only over the race of Abraham! As though they were not messengers to all nations, for all generations and times to come! Or has perhaps the clear meaning of the story of Cain, who was before Abraham, remained concealed to you? And did the prophets promise a Christ only to Jewish publicans? No, the heart of all the sons of Adam is sick, and needs the healing Physician, who, provided with the balsam of heaven, descends to heal the burning wounds made by sin. But just here we see the spirit of the proud language of the false heralds of freedom, so unlike the prophets, that, instead of urging the people to humility, it begets in them a spirit of haughtiness. An unwarrantable violence is done to the sacred art of language, where men think they cannot celebrate in glowing enough terms that deceiving trust in the efficacy of a high moral power, and so destroy in its very root the peculiar significance of religious life. And yet there is nothing more needed in our time than to warm up the religious feeling, which threatens to freeze up under the chilling breath of a one-sided mental culture, or else, irritated and unnaturally roused by the inimical pressure of an entirely opposite tendency, makes room for itself by sickly movements, which, however, are reproved with the least effect when rebuked by such as are furthest from all religion. If you do not, like the prophets of the Old Testament, terrify the hearts of the people by denunciations against sin, and show them in unveiled truth their needy poverty, but continue, with the unsuspected poison of sweet enthusiasm, to rock their consciences into torpid slumber, then you will help to form a generation totally wanting in depth and fidelity of soul, those ancient ornaments of Germans.

But those tall cedar like forms of Old Testament prophecy do not always roar in the storms and blasts of divine wrath over the corruption of the times; they sound forth also consoling tones of coming salvation into the

desert confusion of a mournful present. The constant change from night to day appears in all addresses of the exalted seers; so that when with threats of heavy misfortune, they have humbled the faithless, they raise up again the contrite with promises of brighter days. It is ever the anger of love that moves them as they threaten and comfort in the name of him, who, though a burning fire of righteous visitation, is yet a mild light of reconciling love. So prophesies Isaiah: "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined." (Isa. 9 : 2.)

Under the strongest impulse of holy inspiration, the prophets set themselves on the heavenly watch-towers, from which in the illumined distance they behold the Redeemer in the sublime brightness of divine-human manifestation: then the power and glow of their eloquence mount to the summit of magnificence. Yes, therein are the prophets great, and such heroes of faith, as may well put many a good Christian to the blush, that they, with joyful, unwavering confidence, look for the victorious fulfilment of God's kingdom in that One, into whose salvation, yet to appear in the distant future, they never tire of looking, (vid. 1 Pet. 1: 10–12,) while we have long since heard the glad news that he has come, and yet know not how calmly enough to view the mysterious though certain development of his work of redemption.

But where the spirit of discord dwells there no Christ is found. The prophet of the Old Testament also censures abuses wherever he meets them, and strives by his frank wisdom to lead his country to an ever higher perfection. Yet where is that disposition to find fault with and deny everything, by which our time is so easily set in motion? Let each one labor on with conscientious deligence in the calling that God gives him, and quietly await the day when God will pronounce judgment on his deeds. Thus the prophets labored and administered their trusts who were the appointed guardians and protectors of the theocracy,

according to which the perfect power of the one God is represented by one king in the state. Therefore the tree of prophecy first grows out of the soil of the established kingdom. In the storms and distress of the times, the prophets rise at the side of the trembling throne like mighty supports and pillars. Like the lawgiver, Moses, most zealously strove, by a strenuous restraint from idolatry, to educate to a compact unity the people who so easily tended to native sensuality, so the prophets, who were his worthy successors and interpreters, amid renunciations and oppressions of all kinds, wielded the two-edged, all-dividing sword of eloquent truth against the seducing idols of the day; and when with powerful voice, they expose their nothingness, their language is pointed with the most biting scorn. For them, the throne rests unshaken on the immovable foundation of God's holy law; on it sits the inviolable representative of the heavenly King; the heavenly King speaks to his anointed by the mouth of his prophet; the prophet stands as mediator and interpreter of the Highest Will between king and people. And so the divine truth which manifests itself plainly in every direction hovering over all estates of the realm and the whole history of the people, is represented by men who receive their consecration from the Spirit of God to be advisers of kings and teachers of the people. But what is the consecration of the Holy Ghost? Let one of the oldest of the prophets answer, Amos, who, out of the quiet vale, where, devoted to nature, he had peacefully pastured his flocks, betakes himself into the turmoil of the city, and who, unallured by the blandishments of sin, is driven on by an unconquerable impulse to wield the staff of his mouth against its power. "The lion hath roared, who will not fear? the Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophecy" (Amos 3: 8).

This resistless impulse of the soul to speak against the corruption of the time, against apostacy from God, declares itself to be the same Spirit which, at the creation of the world, moved creative over the face of the waters. It is impossible it should spring from anything earthly when it

has that power that restrains all self-love, so that he who is filled by it appears elevated above the crowd, which calls him a man of God. It is independent of earthly prerogatives, and being no minister to the flesh, but, in keenest contrast, spirit, it bursts in mysterious ways upon souls, kindling like lightning from above, creating and generating like a new felt moral energy, like a life begetting breath of spring. Its inspiring manifestation is attached to no privileged rank, but wherever it arises there is the seal and the nobility of true prophecy.

Before this heavenly power, which as a voice of the Lord resounds in the thunder of the words, must bow every earthly dignity, the despotism of kings, and the ambition of priests. Yes, therein we recognise the ideal meaning of the constitution of the biblical state, that in it, tyranny and priestly rule, which else just in the Orient obtain in greatest fertility, melt before the fresh breath of free prophecy, that illuminating spirit of the theocracy. For whoever the uninformed may be that ridicule the thocratic constitution, they are such as have contented themselves with a superficial look at its mere outward scaffolding. But you who seek to find in the constitution freedom in harmony with firmness, does there not shine out on you from the inmost sanctuary of Israel's political structure the orginal model of this rare union? We meet the theocratic constitution indeed in the old and new Orient, but, outside of revelation, only distorted and spurious. The divine government in its earthly representatives changes to selfish, human autocracy, for the prophets are wanting, the sacred mediators between king and people.

As Moses, in the Old Testament spoke that significant word: "After me there will come others, them shall ye hear," he raised the living, progressive spirit of his law above the dead, rigid letter of it; and as the history of Israel moved on to the inevitable founding of the kingdom, then the priest-prophet Samuel sacrificed the priest to the prophet and anointed Saul. But when it happens that men of learning and fine historical research confound pro-

phets and priests, it is not to be wondered at, if some find among the Hebrews only an hierarchical kingdom that oppressed the freedom of the people. But just that spiritual power, an immediate emanation of the divine life, which lends to the artist the perfection of beauty, to the hero the palm of victory, awakes the freedom of truth in the prophet and makes him a terror to all tyranny.

All political wisdom is put to the blush by the penetrating seer's-glance of the prophet, who, untrammeled by earthly narrow-mindness and bias, recognises only faithful adherance to the commands of the Holy One, whose ambassador he is, as prudence in prince and people. Those godly men of the Old Testament are in this sense justly called also seers. For though wound around with the most intricate web of resisting forces, they yet know how to see, with certain glance, the only way of escape from all dangers. They are in the infallible possession of that glorious gift of prophecy, which from the past solves the riddles of the present and future. Take them therefore as models, ye who think yourselves called to be prophets of the people in our day. Read as they did in the book of history; test the old past with calmness, before you attempt to utter and bless the world with forms of new wisdom of your own making. That resistless law of retribution, which stands written on every page of history in letters not to be effaced, the old prophets always kept before their eyes in undimmed clearness. From it they draw wisdom that never deceives, that they may place the future before the people. This wisdom kindles in them the almighty truth of the word and effects the endless miracles of holy eloquence.

Art. III.—TABLE MOVINGS AND SPIRIT RAPPINGS.

1. *Les Tables tournantes; Les Mediums et les Esprits. Par Louis Figuier.*
2. *Spirit-Rapping made easy. Once a Week*, 1860. 403, 489 and 512.

Nihil sub sole novum, nec valet quisquam dicere: Ecce hoc recens est: jam enim praecessit in saeculis, quae fuerunt ante nos.—*Ecclesiastes* 1: 10.

Our delusions are like the sports of children,—they have their day of honor and when that is over their place is occupied by that which is for the time being more novel; both delusions and sports move in cycles, and the old is ever being reproduced to demand attention or wonder as in the days of its first appearance. The very Salem witches, whose wondrous mischievous performances excited our smiles years since, and made us pity the credulous New England fathers, performed no deeds more ludicrous than some of those which are known in common parlance as "table-movings" and "spirit-rappings;" still there is a family resemblance between the two which satisfies us the modern performances are not more dignified, mysterious or more calculated to challenge our respect than those produced in the last century. In previous articles published in the current volume of the Review,* we have endeavored to show how hysteria would explain many of the bodily and mental phenomena exhibited by the fanatical, and how involuntary complicity of thought would explain muscular movements which had been declared altogether beyond the agency of volition, and the result of some mysterious power. In the present article, we hope to show how these two causes may explain so much of the wonderful in the latest and most fashionable delusion of the times, that we will be justified in believing the whole to be a

---

Mer. Rev. XIII, 33, 238, 374.

fraud or a self-deception on the part of those who are engaged in the manifestations. We do not deem it necessary to attempt the explanation of every thaumaturgic exhibition. *Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus* is a very good maxim in such examinations. If a portion of the operations attributed to supernatural means is found to be clearly the result of ordinary causes, the conclusion is not unnatural that the whole may have been produced in the same way.

It seems to us a waste of time to discuss whether *spiritual* (our readers will understand that this word is employed throughout this article as simply indicating a series of phenomena or effects, which have been attributed to supernatural causes,) communications have proceeded from truthful or lying spirits, from messengers of good or the father of lies. The first thing to be done is to find out whether the whole series of phenomena could be produced by agencies which are open to scientific examination, and should such an investigation be attended with success, we are at once placed in a position to give a decision. But should we fail, then the nature of these phenomena and the nature of the pretended supernatural information may be inquired into, so as to find out whether they be of sufficient magnitude to invest with the character of the miraculous, which inquiry would be settled by their self-authenticating character; or are worthless and consist of a series of lies and deceptions, in which case it would be of no importance to know whether the devil was mediately or immediately concerned, since he may work just as effectively in doing evil, in either way. We propose the first mode of examination in this article believing it will furnish us satisfactory results, and that the presumptive dignity, which arises from a serious theological consideration of this subject, should not be allowed to rest on it and that some of our able theologians have really done injury to the cause of true religion by discussing the nature of these manifestations as serious theological errors, whereas they never rise above the level of cleverly-executed tricks. In this view we shall

use as our guide the impartial, critical mind of Figuier, although we should not consider his skepticism as a reliable guide in the second method of examination.

Many of the wonders of spiritualism were anticipated by the operations of Count Cagliostro, who, for a long time, occupied the attention of the French people by his pretended powers over things hidden in the bosom of the future. His magic mirrors exhibited much that has since been explained by the phenomena of hypnotism, and the influence exerted by him and his followers over the people finds an explanation in the peculiar willingness evinced by persons in a high state of nervous exaltation to assume, as their own, any direction which a strong mind may strive to give them. Other phenomena, belonging to the so-called animal magnetism, attracted attention from students in different parts of the world, but these phenomena multiplied in the year 1846 to such an extent that a furor was created on the subject.

The case of Angelique Cottin, a girl, fourteen years old, of the village of Boutigny is so remarkable that an examination of the facts will prepare us for the consideration of the Table-rappings of the United States. Early in January 1846, this young girl being engaged in weaving some silk gloves, the oak table to which the woof was attached was observed to move about, and efforts to keep it at rest proved unavailing. Her companions shrieked so as to bring in the neighbors. These requested the girls to seat themselves at the table again, with the view of seeing whether the movements would be renewed,—but the phenomena were only reproduced when Angelique renewed her position at the woof,—the table then began to sway backwards and forwards and finally it was upset. Of course the conclusion arrived at was that she was bewitched (it is a convenient thing to have some word which can be employed as an explanation for that which is obscure and unintelligible). The next morning the same movements were exhibited by the table when she took her place, and between eight and nine o'clock they increased so much in character

that it was necessary to assign her another table for her work, and this table was immediately upset. To avoid this interference with her work, the glove on which she was working was attached to a trough weighing 75 kilsgrammes (about pounds), but this was also caused to rock. These effects were soon communicated to the whole neighborhood, and the villagers insisted that the spirit which was, in their opinion, the cause of all these erratic movements, should be exorcised. The priest, however, desired to see with his own eyes the phenomena, and soon convinced himself that not religious rites, but medical treatment was demanded.

Careful examination being made as to the phenomena, it was discovered that various other bodies were repelled with great force, when she approached them, and even when her clothing was brought into contact,—special repulsive power seemed to exist in the lower portion of her skirts. Shocks were also received when the knuckles of her companions were brought near her face. She was prevented from occupying a chair or bed and could only be comfortable when resting on her knees in the middle of the house. With the view of having some occupation, she attempted to hull a basket of beans, but the latter, as soon as her hands were plunged in the basket, commenced leaping about in all directions. The phenomena of repulsion were exhibited in many ways, and their fame reached Paris, whither her parents brought her with the view of making some profit. Men of science attended her exhibitions, and Arago himself, at the observatory, had an opportunity of noticing the following phenomena: "She directed her hand towards a sheet of paper placed on the table, when the paper was immediately attracted with great force towards the hand.—Angélique having approached a small stand and gently touched it with her apron the stand was repelled.—Being seated on a chair with her feet placed on the ground, the chair was violently projected against the wall, while she was thrown in an opposite direction. This experiment was repeated several times, and Arago and

his companions failed to keep the chair firm and immovable." On the strength of these phenomena Arago demanded that the Academy of Sciences should appoint a commission for their investigation. Arago, Becquerel, Isidore-Geoffroy, Saint-Hilaire, Babinet, Rayer and Pariset physicists and naturalists—were appointed to conduct the same. They endeavored, by physical apparatus, to detect the presence of free electricity, analogous to that which is found in the electrical eel (gymnotus electricus), the electrical torpedo, &c. But no such free electricity was revealed, and the phenomena of repulsion of furniture, &c., became more and more rare. Their report (March 9, 1846) declares that *no* phenomena of repulsion were exhibited in their presence when portions of her dress were brought in contact with articles of furniture, and "the only fact observed by them was that of violent movements communicated to chairs on which she was sitting. Serious suspicions having been excited by the manner in which these movements took place, they determined to examine them very carefully, and came to the conclusion that they might have been produced by concealed adroit movements of her hands and feet."

A similar case to that of Angélique Cottin was presented by Honorine Séguin, aged thirteen years six months; tables were over-turned and chairs made to move about in the most erratic manner. The effects produced were absolutely involuntary and after some weeks disappeared never to return again. In this case, also, the electrical tests employed could detect no indications of the presence of free electricity.

Figuier thinks that the case of Honorine confirms the truth of the electric properties alleged to exist in Angélique, and proves that there was "neither fraud, nor collusion, but simply a pathological condition, which disappeared as spontaneously as it appeared, and like all abnormal troubles disturbing the nervous system may disappear. By this explanation the case of Angélique is freed from the supernatural character, which it was supposed to possess, and

the scientific explanation proves to be of more account than systematic skepticism and denial."

We are at a loss to account for the conclusion thus stated. Curious movements are attributed to electrical action, but the most delicate tests fail to detect the presence of electricity,—tests that were most satisfactory in detecting it in animals, whose physical demonstrations of power were feeble in comparison with those of the two girls, failed. The possibility, nay, the probability of these effects being the results of voluntary muscular exertions is distinctly stated by men who have examined the cases with scientific care and unprejudiced minds, and is not the conclusion most natural that what cannot be proven to be the result of electrical power and yet may have been produced by muscular exertion, has really been thus produced? We think there can be but one answer to this question. In reply to the query, "What motives could these poor girls have had thus to deceive," we have simply to say, that hysteria is the fruitful parent of manifold forms of eccentric conduct which cannot be judged of by the same rules that are applicable in cases of healthy minds acting in healthy bodies.

An accumulation of free electricity on the surface of the human body is not a very rare occurrence. In dry, cold mornings the crackling sound produced by the passage of a horn comb through the hair, is attributable to this cause. Occasionally we may find a young lady who, by shuffling her slippered foot over the hearth rug, accumulates so much of the electrical fluid as to be enabled to ignite a jet of gas, issuing from the gas-burner, or even to communicate a violent shock from her knuckles to a bystander. These cases, however, carry with them their own explanation and bear no relation to other movements, which when carefully examined, can be explained without the existence of electrical aid.

In the same year, 1846, while Angélique Cottin's case was attracting some attention in Paris, a coal merchant living in the Rue Neuve de Cluny was subjected to a series of annoyances, in comparison with which the feats of

ground and lofty tumbling executed by furniture and kitchen utensils, in the days of Mather, were simple child's play. Building stones were hurled against the doors, windows and roof. The size of the stones and the force with which they fell seem to militate against the idea that they were thrown by hand. The occupant of the house made complaint to the authorities, showing the damage done not only to his house and furniture, but also to his own body, from the missives thus mysteriously hurled against the house. The police failed to detect the cause, which was at last presumed to be the coal-dealer himself, who had become dissatisfied with the house and hoped by this means to get rid of his lease.

These cases seemed to produce others; moving tables, dancing tea trays, and gymnastic tea pots began to appear in different parts of France. Even weighty articles of furniture, highly respected and endeared to families by years of constant association, caught the contagion and attempted the slow movements of a *minuet de la cour* when the circumstances of their construction did not justify the quick movements of the fashionable waltz. The epidemic always seized houses occupied by families who had bright and quick servants. Rarely if ever was any acknowledgment made by those suspected of being the mistresses of ceremonies at these *revels* of inanimate bodies, and, as in the days of Salem, history could only record the facts and leave posterity to reason on the causes. The most exciting and interesting events must of course come to an end, and finally the fantastic movements of household and kitchen furniture in France ceased,—the dignity of heir loom chairs and tables was no longer disturbed. But the spirit which was pro tempore quieted in France soon asserted its authority and might in our own land and here more wonderful events were produced, and were unhesitatingly attributed to supernatural agencies, which certain favored *media* were supposed capable of enlisting in their service whenever they pleased.

It has been well said that the exploded heresies and humbugs of Europe grow with remarkable luxuriance when

transplanted to the United States. We are so eager for novelties and so energetic in our partizanship, that we carry the latter invariably to a most ridiculous extreme. Should the novelty prove to be of real value it is likely that the American mind will speedily make this available to the greatest number possible, but, on the other hand, should it be worthless the evil is widely disseminated and made to bear an abundant harvest of delusion and misery. This has been the case with Mesmerism, Homoeopathy, Hydropathy and many other forms of delusion. At times, however, we have returned the compliment and transplanted some of our delusions to European shores, where they have been kindly received and carefully nourished. Mormonism has thus grown quite luxuriantly in Europe, and gathered a number of converts. Table movings have been common to the two continents, but on our own they have prevailed so extensively as to give the appearance of an epidemic which in a few years swept the entire country, involving all classes, ages and professions. It would be impossible to give even a general outline of the history of this epidemic, or to mention the number of books that have been written on the subject, some professing to consider it scientifically, others theologically, others remarkable only for the stupid blindness of their writers, and others again for the unbounded gullibility with which their authors seem to be supplied. Some few cases must be considered and then an attempt be made at their explanation in cases where the parties concerned were knowingly perpetrating a fraud, as well as in those where they were self-deceived.

The names of the Misses Fox are connected in this country with the reintroduction of table movings. They took possession of a house in Hydesville, N. Y., from which the previous occupant had decamped in consequence of annoyances in the way of knocks at the front door, movements of furniture and various other strange phenomena, which, to say the least, were not conducive to the comfort and peace of its inmates. These ladies soon learned not to fear the

manifestations, but discovered that they were produced by supernatural beings and that the latter could be made useful as intelligence-agents to novelty-seeing humanity. At first, the sounds were supposed to be produced by rats, but examination showed that they must proceed from some other cause. Familiarity with the sounds emboldened the mother of the young ladies to address their source one evening in the month of March, 1848. To the question, "Does the sound proceed from a dead person?" there was an affirmative answer, that is to say a knock. The ages of the ladies were also correctly given by a number of knocks, one answering to each year of their lives. The whole family were attracted by this novelty—and Mrs. Fish (a married daughter of the family), living in Rochester, soon became an adept in interpreting these knockings, her father's family having removed from Hydesville, bringing along with them, *mirabile dictu*, the knockings with all their peculiarities. The whole thing was astonishing—revelations were to be had from the spirit-world by the simple payment of a fee to this family. The veil hiding the mysterious realm of the dead from the eye of man was torn down, and the spirits of deceased relatives could be summoned from "the bourne whence no traveller returns" to answer idle questions as to their ages, names, &c.;—and not only this, the manes of the great departed, whose acquaintance in life was denied to commoners, could be induced to answer the summons of any blockhead whose money was expended for the purpose. Here was a complete realization of the equality to which that great leveller—death—reduces all men, making them even subject to the whims and caprices of the living.

The nature of the exhibitions given by the Fox family differed somewhat as the company, assembled to witness them, differed. If credulity was largely developed in the spectators, the exhibitions were more wonderful and mysterious than when those of little faith and much scientific inquisitiveness were present. A reverend gentleman, whose studies had doubtless unfitted him for close physi-

cal scrutiny of phenomena, was favored with the sight of a shadowy hand which gently stroked a lock of his hair, with the contact of an icy hand on his face causing a chill throughout his frame similar to that produced by the contact of a dead body, and with the singular appearance of furniture moving about in the wildest disorder. He is satisfied that if deception had existed he could have detected it, and prefers to be credulous as to the view which suggests the action of supernatural agencies, rather than to that view which admits of fraud or cheiromantic dexterity in effecting such unusual occurrences.

But a corps of scientific gentlemen, after examining with great care the knockings and movings produced under the superintendence of this same family, do not hesitate to pronounce them the results of physical agencies employed by living human beings,—having been able in some cases to detect the probable modus operandi.

The believers in the supernatural causes of these phenomena were not confined to the illiterate, but were found in all classes of society. Many of the clergy, members of the legal and medical profession, tradesmen, scholars and mechanics were enrolled in the list of the so-called spiritualists. Those who paid much attention to the subject were soon recognizable in the community by a change in habits and manners, not unlike those always occurring among enthusiasts on all subjects. At least one prominent scientific scholar was enlisted in their ranks, and it was surprizing to see how his natural acuteness of powers of observation were absolutely blunted by his faith, so that, that which bystanders could perceive was a badly concealed trick was sometimes adopted with readiness by him as absolute truth. An illustration of this we will present further on in the course of this article.

Finally the excitement became so great in the United States, that a petition was addressed to Congress, signed by a large number of citizens, directing its attention to the subject and asking a public examination of the same. This petition enumerates the phenomena and asks for an exam-

ination by a commission appointed by Congress. It states that "it cannot be denied with any reason that the various phenomena of which it treats are destined to produce important and durable results, affecting in a permanent manner, the physical condition, mental development and moral character of a large proportion of the American people. It is patent that these occult powers influence the essential principles of health and life, of thought and action,—and hence they may be destined to modify the conditions of our existence, of the faith and philosophy of our age, as well as of the government of the world." For these reasons the petitioners demanded that a suitable commission be appointed to prosecute investigations on this subject.

The phenomena called spiritual may be classed under four heads—1, the movement of tables and other articles of furniture; 2, rappings and knockings which were alleged to be caused by supernatural beings with the view of communicating with man; 3, the reception of written messages alleged to be *written* by spiritual beings acting through the body of the person holding the pencil or even directly moving the pencil without any intermediation; 4, the presentation of the actual person of the spirit so as to be recognizable by bystanders. We do not pretend to say that all the protean forms, which this disease assumed, could be strictly confined to these four heads, but their consideration will put us in a position to understand the subject tolerably well.

As regards those employed in the movements of articles of furniture we must willingly recognize the fact that the majority are perfectly honest and sincere, incapable of an attempt to deceive. In such view it becomes important to discover how one may be active in producing such movements without wishing it, or even when firmly determined that he will resist any tendency to move that he may discover in the table. Ordinarily such movements are produced by the following arrangement: a number of persons are seated around the table with their hands resting on it; —conversation or levity of any kind is prohibited,—the

mind becomes entirely fixed on the movement expected. Eventually this takes place, and the rotation is accomplished with greater or less rapidity. In our article on *The Divining Rod* we referred to Chevreul's explanation of the motion of the pendule explorateur, and as he bases his explanation of table movings on the theory, then advanced we extract the following from his letter to Ampére :

" When I held the pendulum in my hand, a muscular movement of my arm, although insensible to me, forced the pendulum from its condition of repose, and the oscillations once established were soon augmented by the influence that vision exercised in the way of putting me into that peculiar disposition or tendency to motion. Still it must be acknowledged that the muscular movement, even when it has been exaggerated by this tendency to motion, can easily be checked, I can not say by the power of the will, but when one has simply the thought of trying whether it could be checked. There is then an intimate connection established between the execution of certain motions and the act of thinking respecting it, although this thinking is not the will which commands the muscular organs. In this respect the phenomena I have described seem to me to have some interest for psychology and even for natural science ;—they prove how easily illusions may be taken for reality, whenever we are investigating phenomena in the performance of which our own organs are engaged, and under circumstances which have not yet been analyzed."

Chevreul applies the theory of insensible muscular motion to the table movings of the times. When a number of persons are placed around a table, their hands being upon it, they are all awaiting a rotation of the same either from right to left or from left to right, and thus they are unconsciously acting upon the table with some force. If the same direction of rotation is not expected by all, no motion will result,—or the motion will be very slight at first and then increase in rapidity. When the company anxiously *wish* that the table should move, such a result is most generally attained; when they wish that the table should re-

main at rest, motion is exceedingly rare. This theory may be adequate for the explanation of simple rotation of tables, yet there seems to be something wanting when we endeavor to apply it to the movement of bodies of great weight.

Babinet presents a theory, substantially the same as that originated by Chevreul, relating however only to the movements of tables and not taking into consideration the rappings and knockings which attend the exhibitions of mediums. "Every thing is referred to unconscious motions of our muscular fibres, to nascent or incipient motions."

Faraday has also investigated this subject with great care, and showed that the rotation was produced by the muscular force of the persons seated at the table without the aid and assistance of any other power whatever. By a very simple experiment he showed that the hands actually exercised some force before the table commenced to move. All these explanations are based upon truth, but they do not present us a theory complete enough to meet all cases. Something more is still necessary. It is true they furnish us enough to overthrow the pretensions of the spiritualists, but not enough to satisfy the man of science. Science is never satisfied with mere negations of pretended explanations; within her own domain she is never satisfied unless she can remove all obscurity and illumine the whole field of view.

As the history of novelties during this century would lead us to expect, the movements were attributed by some to a fluid, whether electric, magnetic, or vital, it was not stated. Gasparin has been the principal supporter of this theory. It is the old theory advanced by believers in Animal Magnetism. "According to the partizans of this theory, the same fluid which, emanating from the body of the magnetizer, plunges the subject exposed to its action into a state of somnambulism, is capable by exhalation from the bodies of persons forming the chain, of shaking a table and, by its own mechanical impulse, of producing motion." Babinet has overthrown this attempted explanation by the statement that *the nervous influence can not*

pass beyond the epidermis. "This is one of the most firmly established truths of physiology and a principle which must not be lost sight of, since it is sufficient to overthrow the hypothesis of a fluid applied to the interpretation of table-movings."

But we have been following the explanations of science, without listening to those which the operators themselves furnish on this subject;—and this is simply in accordance with our purpose as stated in the commencement of this article. Their theory, however, may be stated in few words,—all dogmatic statements have this peculiarity. "If a table turns after a quarter of an hour of fixed attention on the part of the experimenters, the moving agency is spiritual; good or bad spirits, angels or demons, have entered the table and have put it in motion." But before we are driven to the adoption of a theory, even more mysterious than the phenomena themselves, it is necessary to look still further into the realm of the natural for the explanation.

Indeed here we can resort to the curious facts which modern physiologists have studied, and to which we have adverted in our article on Animal Magnetism in the April number of the Review,—these will enable us to get something like an explanation of the phenomena. As the application of hypnotism to this subject has been well made by Figuier, we prefer to let him speak here in his own words. "Let us recollect that in consequence of the great cerebral tension resulting from a long-continued contemplation of a fixed object, the brain falls into a particular condition, which has been successively called by the names of *magnetic state*, *nervous sleep*, and biological state, different names designating different varieties of a condition, generally identical. Once placed in this condition, whether by the passes of a magnetizer, as has been done since the time of Mesmer, or by the contemplation of a brilliant object, as Braid operated, afterwards imitated by Philips and as the Arabian and Egyptian sorcerers operated, or indeed simply by strong moral excitement, examples of which

we have known, the individual falls into that automatic passivity which constitutes *nervous sleep*. He has lost the power of directing and controlling his will proper, and is in the power of another's will. A glass of water is presented to him with the declaration that it is a delicious beverage, and he drinks it believing it to be wine, a liqueur or milk according to the wish of him who has so strongly seized, as it were, upon his existence. Thus deprived of the aids of his own private judgment, the individual is almost a stranger to his own actions, and when restored to his natural condition he loses the recollection of the actions he has performed during the singular and temporary abdication of the *ego*. He is under the influence of *suggestions*, that is to say, accepting, without the power of rejecting, a definite idea presented to him by another's will; he acts and is forced to act without thought, without will, and consequently without consciousness. This theory solves a grave question in psychology for a man thus effected has lost his proper will and cannot be fully responsible for his acts. He acts, determined by images intruded on his brain, analogous to those visions which Cuvier supposed were fixed in the *sensorium* of the bee, and which represent the form and proportions of the cell that instinct impels it to construct. The principle of *suggestions* explains perfectly the phenomena so varied and sometimes so terrible of hallucination, and shows at the same time what slight ground separates a man laboring under hallucination from a monomaniac. It is not astonishing to find that in a large number of table turners, the hallucination survives the experiment and is converted into positive madness."

"This principle of *suggestions*, under the influence of nervous sleep, appears to us to furnish an explanation of the phenomena of table-movings in their simplest form. Let us see what takes place in the chain of persons who have arranged themselves for an experiment of this kind. Fixed attention and introspection of thought is recommended. The longer this attention continues, and the moral excitement continues, the more the brain becomes fatigued,

and the thoughts become confused. * * In such a party of persons, * * the largest number experience no particular effect. But it is a rare occurrence if one of them is not thrown for an instant in the hypnotic or biological condition. It is necessary that this condition should continue but for a second in order that the phenomena should be produced. One member of the circle falls into this state of nervous half-somnolence, having no consiousness of his acts and no other thought than the fixed idea that the table will move, and actually unknown to himself gives the impulse to the table; at this instant he may employ a muscular force which is, relatively speaking, considerable and the table moves. This impulse being given, this *unconscious* action accomplished, nothing more is needed. The individual, thus slightly biologized, may immediately return to his original condition, for scarcely has this movement of mechanical displacement been exhibited, than all those who compose the circle rise and follow the movement, or, to speak differently, make the table continue in motion, believing that they but follow its motions. As for the individual, the involuntary cause of the phenomena, since he cannot recollect any thing done in the state of nervous sleep, —he is ignorant of what he has done and is indignant if accused of having pushed the table. He suspects the other members of the circle of having done that of which they accuse him."

It will be observed that this explanation applies to the simplest movements of tables over floors,—such movements as occur when neophytes in the psychomantic art are experimenting on small tables and other articles of furniture. The latter really are moved without any intention of deception on the part of those composing the circle,—and with the simple phenomenon of a table peregrinating a room with a circle of excited persons surrounding it, each thinking he is resisting the tendency to motion, when in fact he is aiding it, this explanation has to do. We quote from the same author his explanation as to more complex phenomena, reserving an exhibit of the means by which

these phenomena may be dishonestly produced until we have finished what we have to present concerning those persons engaged in table-moving who are self-deceived, in consequence of the nervous state into which they are thrown. "As to movements of tables in response to questions, table-legs that rise in obedience to orders, and which by the number of blows given respond to questions, the same theory is available, if you only admit that among the persons composing the circle there is one whose state of nervous sleep continues for a certain length of time. This individual, hypnotized without his knowledge, responds to questions and orders given him, inclining the table or making it give the number of blows required by the questions. When restored to his natural condition he forgets all the actions done in this way, just as every magnetized or hypnotized individual loses the recollection of acts performed during that condition. The individual is a kind of waking sleeper; he is *non sui compos*,—is in a mental condition which partakes both of the character of somnambulism and fascination. He is not asleep,—he is charmed or fascinated in consequence of the strong moral concentration imposed on him : he is a *medium*. But as this latter form of experiment is of a higher order than the first, it is not accomplished in every group. In order that the table should respond to questions that may be asked, it is necessary that the persons who operate should have practised the phenomena for some time, and that among them there should be one, a subject specially liable to fall into this condition, who habitually falls into it quickly and continues in it for some time, he must be in a word a tried *medium*. * * Custom makes the attainment of the condition an easy and sure thing. Practised mediums can in a very short time place themselves in this condition of nervous half-somnolence, which makes the fact of the rotation of the table inevitable, and the movement communicated by them to the article of furniture conformable to the demand."

The simple fact that tables were moved when a circle of persons were seated around with their hands resting on

them, was at first a novelty so strange that the world did not weary of witnessing it for a long time. Fatigue, *ennui* at length demanded something additional. This was furnished by the knocks, produced by the rising and falling of one or two of the legs of the table. It was an easy matter to attribute these knocks to supernatural causes, as their real cause was not suspected. Soon an alphabet was arranged and then the whole armament was prepared for invading the credulity of man and demanding his unreserved faith. The hypnotized individual (we are speaking now of honest operators, our attention will be claimed by the others directly,) produced such movements as answered to the questions propounded. These answers were not always correct,—nay rarely were correct,—still a ready explanation was at hand in the statement that lying spirits would sometimes displace those who dealt in truth and thus error was always possible. And here a significant fact may be alluded to. Errors were more frequent when the circle was composed of simple-minded, honest, ingenuous persons, than when the crafty composed it. One would have supposed that the former would have been the proper mediums for spiritual communication, and that the brightness of the truth would shine all the more on account of the dullness of the medium. In truth the crafty knew how to prepare themselves with suitable answers for all probable questions, and thus the unwary spectator was most frequently taken in by them.

Still another advance was demanded, however, in this mode of obtaining information from the spirit world,—human ingenuity was tasked on this question. A pencil was fitted in the end of one of the table legs, this was placed over a large sheet of paper, and when the movements were made, the answer was written out more or less legibly by the pencil. The transparent deception was still received bonâ-fide by believers; and in order to give a more ready method of writing a special arrangement was invented, a *spirit-tablet*, which consisted of an oval tablet, moving on castors, supplied with a pencil at one end; it was placed on a sheet of

white paper laid on the table,—the medium's hand was placed on the tablet and then the answer was given by the tracings which the pencil made in moving over the paper. The slow process of spelling out words from the knocks was thus dispensed with, and sentences could be put together very rapidly. But every science, art and branch of knowledge is progressive, and we are not surprized that at length all machinery is dispensed with,—the medium is placed at the table, pecil in hand, and the operator, after a moment's quiet reflection, addresses the question, the medium writes and *this* is the answer of the spirit. Here we have direct analogy, according to Figuier, between the medium, and the subject of the mesmerizer. Both are in the same psychological condition, and, when restored to the normal state, are ignorant as to what has transpired. Each at times may suppose himself animated by the spirit of some deceased person, and if his knowledge of the habits, modes of thought, style of composition and cheirography be at all accurate, the written answer to the request made will be of such a character as might reasonably be expected. If, however, there should exist ignorance on these points, then the answers will be lamentably erroneous. We have seen a note, purporting to have been written by Benjamin Franklin, the cheirography of which was a remarkable imitation of the old philosopher's, yet the substance (it was a note to one of his descendants) showed the silliness of the medium (whether honest or dishonest,)—it read thus ; "If my relative will have a circle at his house, I will convince him of my existence." The answer returned was, "Tell him that I never doubted his existence."

But the directness of our communication with the spirit world does not cease with the use even of the pencil. There are those who pretend that their souls are taken possession of by the spirits of the departed, who then speak through their lips. The spirit evoked is then responsible for whatever is said, gets all the credit, the medium having only the muscular labor to undergo required in pronouncing the words or furnishing the requisite gesticulations.

Here we have all the extravagances of the past ages reproduced. Nervous persons in a high state of excitement have from time to time claimed the gift of prophecy, the power of presenting in a connected form the incidents of the past or of revealing the thoughts of the living. We have seen how such an asserted gift of prophecy may pass over a land like a mighty epidemic. What wonder then that this form of mental delusion should have been prevalent but a few years since, and that even now male and female mediums announce that the spirits of Webster, Clay and Jackson will, through their mouths, give their opinion on the national crisis and the duty of Americans with reference to it, or that some one of the holy Fathers of the Christian Church will denounce the Church spirit of the times, the adoption of rites and ceremonies, the practice of liturgical worship—things which might have been very good early in the history of religion, but which are now supplanted by true evangelicalism, or educated morality! The delusion, where the medium is honest, is most complete, terminating in a species of monomania,—which eventually becomes absolute madness.

In this country, many victims to these delusions have terminated their lives in Asylums and some have been driven to suicide. Such a result is nothing more than what might be expected. The hyper-excited condition of the nervous system of course is attended with a low degree of cerebral congestion, which may terminate in mental aberration or even death. One of the principal spiritualists in France (Hennequin) died in a mad house,—and many a family circle has been broken up by the entrance of this so-called spiritualism with its train of mental hallucinations and nervous extacies. Surely the psychologico-physiological explanation of this whole subject is sufficient, without any need of theological argumentation. But with this explanation there is connected a moral: persons of a nervous temperament, as they value the health of their bodies, minds and souls, should avoid all connection with table movings or spirit rappings. The brain is too easily disor-

dered,—its delicate mechanism is too easily deranged for one with such a temperament to risk the consequences of hypnotic excitement, of cerebral congestion whether great or little.

The so-called communications from the spirits always partake of the sentiments and character of thought of the medium. When the latter is pervaded with a vein of piety, the language may be scriptural; when with a sceptical or atheistic spirit, this will be found pervading the revelation. The revelations are emphatically all things to all persons. It is said a medium in Paris when asked if there was a devil, gave the following written answer:—"*J n' existe pas.—Satan.*"

The language in which the answers are given is also that known to the medium, although the quasi spirit when embodied on this earth might have been absolutely ignorant of it: the answers are never given in the native language of the supposed spirit, although the questions may be addressed in it, unless the medium should happen to be familiar with the same. We shall never forget the indignation of an old scientific friend, who addressed Cyrus the Great in Persian, when he found that Cyrus couldn't understand anything but English, and was unable even to give his name in ancient Persian.

The very nature of the communications militates generally against their originating with minds of a high order. They consist of trite moral sayings, or mere jinglings of words, in some instances of mystic nonsense. We have seen a savant delighted with the reception of this remarkable truism—"honesty must be the motto of every honest man." This wonderful concentration of wisdom was communicated at a session when a scientific man, one of the first in this country, whose clearness of perception and accuracy of judgment, on all other subjects but table-movings *et id omne genus*, was not surpassed, through a medium (employing what was called a *spiritoscope*) who was receiving supposed communications from the other world. It was astonishing to see what trifling nonsense was received

as important truth, and how the man of science had become the dupe of the medium. During the session we managed by a dexterous application of one foot against the leg of the table to upset it in the lap of the medium. The reader may judge of our surprise, when the savant asked the question whether the table had been upset by the spirits, at hearing an *affirmative* answer returned by the medium.

But few words are required on the subject of rappings, independent of table-movings,—rappings, the locality of which has generally bewildered the spectators and given the darkest veil of mystery to the whole performance. Prof. Flint and M. Schiff have shown how these could be produced. Of course in treating of this portion of our subject we no longer insist on the sincerity of the operator,—we have now simply to do with fraud and the way in which it is accomplished. There is no nervous state here,—no necessity of hypnotism or biology to explain the phenomena,—these belong to the region of artificial magic, and are susceptible of the same kind of study and examination as those of Heller, Blitz or the Fakir of Ava. "Sounds may be produced by the rapid contraction of certain muscles, without any motion perceptible on the surface of the body." * * For example, the tendon of the *peroneus longus* muscle, striking against its groove or the osseous surface of the fibula, is capable of producing sounds sufficiently loud to be heard at some distance. Schiff, who had succeeded in acquiring considerable skill in this way, could make at will audible sounds which were successive and regular." Velpeau has shown that this kind of sound can be produced in various parts of the body,—the hip, the shoulders, &c. Flint attributed the sounds produced by the members of the Fox family simply to movements of the knee joint, the tibia acting against the former and undergoing a species of lateral displacement;—the sounds were always double, one evidently resulting from the displacement and the other from the restoration of the bone. He had an opportunity of examining the mechanism of the process in the case of a young lady who had taught herself

to produce similar sounds. We can understand why females most generally are distinguished in this "line of business," since the costume of the sex effectually prevents observation of the mechanism of the process.

We had an opportunity during the year 1853, of examining a case where the sounds were produced by the *peroneous longus* muscle, and were surprised at their deceptiveness. The gentleman who was kind enough to allow an examination with the view of satisfying ourselves on the subject, stood in the middle of the floor, and the sounds seemed to proceed from blows given beneath the floor.

The so-called communications from the spirit-world, when made in audible words and sentences, necessarily proceed from ventriloquism. A writer in "Once a Week," an English journal, in several articles under the title "Spirit-Rapping made Easy, or How to come out a Medium," has given at full length an account of the mode of producing all the phenomena which are considered most surprising. Many of the wonderful exhibitions of Mr. Home, who has been figuring before the crowned heads of Europe, are sufficiently explained so as to make us place Mr. H. among the first of modern prestidigitators. It is a significant fact that when Houdin—the famous French magician was present at one of Home's attempted exhibitions before the Emperor, "no manifestation took place." An enquiring master-spirit was present, and it was probably considered impolitic to risk detection.

"The first requisite," says our author, "is an impassive countenance, exhibiting no sense of shame, or fear of detection,—a natural or acquired brass, the perfection of which will depend, of course, upon the morale of the performer. After this, the secret of the medium's power is the flexibility of her lower limbs. Her legs must do the work of arms, and her feet must be educated to act like hands. * It is no use to contemplate coming out as a medium unless you are provided with flexible legs and manipulative feet and toes." The author then goes on to give the modus operandi by which all the wondrous per-

formances of Mr. Home may be produced, and it is singular to see how simple are the contrivances necessary to produce the startling results. We consider the case, so far as the most prominent pretender to association with the spirit world in physical performances is concerned, to be set at rest, and are willing to look upon Mr. Home as a clever charlatan, as well as to adopt the conclusion that he is "a very clever ventriloquist, a superior player on the mouth-harmonicon; that he possesses an accordion, probably self-acting, a magic lantern, a lazy-tongs, much assurance, an accomplice or two—perhaps many of them in various quarters—and a large circle of accommodating dupes, and of candid, half-doubting, half-credulous spectators."

In our examination of this subject we have endeavored to do full justice to those who have been sincerely desirous of avoiding any thing like deception of their friends and others. Many, nay, most all, the phenomena exhibited by them are susceptible of physiological explanation. But we have at the same time tried to show how the most surprising feats of the *great* exhibitors have proceeded from frauds practiced on the credulity of spectators. The present seems a fitting time to discuss the subject, the whirlwind of excitement has passed away. Facts have been collected, discussed and arranged. The sober second-thought of mankind, not always reliable yet by no means to be despised, has pronounced against the arrogant pretensions of the spiritualists. Theologians, who had plunged into the subject with all the zeal of the schoolmen and the exorcists of the early ages, have perceived their folly. And scientific students have taken up the subject quietly and dispassionately notwithstanding their first expressions of disgust.

In closing the series of articles on "The Marvellous in Modern times," we trust that the readers of the Review, who have followed us through what may have too often seemed to be dull detail, have learned to be cautious in giving their credence to all mysterious phenomena which purport to spring from supernatural causes. The miracle

is self-authenticating. An *evident* purpose is manifest in it. Where such self-authentication does not appear, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, it is safe to conclude that the phenomena are susceptible of explanation by physical or psychological laws. There will be no end to manifestations of the marvellous, so long as the world stands, for of these it may be truly said, in the words of the Preacher: "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun."

Frederick city, Md. L. H. S.

Art. IV.—NOTES ON THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS.

[CONCLUDED.]

V. 277. The adverb *κάρτα* may belong either to *νέας* or (perhaps better) to *ἐμωμήσω*. The queen considers the supposition of the chorus as a culpable reflection on her intelligence. "As of a young (or silly) girl you flout my mind," i. e., you place my judgment sarcastically on a level with that of a girl. In a similar manner, Prom. 961, *ἐκερτόμησας δῆθεν ὡς παῖδ' ὄντα με.* Cf. also below v. 466, and v. 1374.

V. 278. *ποίου χρόνου*, "within what time? i. e., when?" This is in accordance with the Greek idiom. The time, within which any thing is done, is regarded as the *substratum* of the action or event, and is regularly put in the genitive. So Herodotus 3, 134 *τοῦτα ὀλίγου χρόνου ἔσται τελεύματα.* Sophoc. Oed. Col. 393, *βαιοῦ κοὐχὶ μυρίου χρόνου, intra breve tempus.* The "quantum temporis elapsum sit, ex quo," of Blomfield, and the "Seit welcher Zeit" of Schneider are not satisfactorily sustained by any examples. Cf. Kühner, § 524, 2. The *καί* after the interrogatives *τίς, πῶς, ποῖ, ποῦ, ποῖος*, adds emphasis to the question, as Porson ad Eurip. Phoen. 1373 has shown. It may here be rendered by "pray, pray tell me," or by the *dic praeterea* of Blomfield. Cf. Soph. Oed. T. 772, 989, 1129; Ajax 1200; Trach. 314; Eurip. Hecuba 515, 1064, 1064, 1201; Hypol. 1171; Hermann ad Viger. p. 837.

V. 279. This genitive comes under the same rule as that of v. 269: "within this very night," &c. With respect to the Athenean method of computing time cf. note to v. 255. —*λέγω*, "I say, maintain, think."

V. 280. The *τόδ'* and *τάχος* of this verse belong together: *tam celeriter.* The accusative is that of the remote or intended effect, on which cf. note to v. 223–226. Instead of

τάχος, *celeriter*, the Greeks also say sometimes κατὰ τάχος. Cf. Kühner § 549, Anm. 3. In place of ἀγγέλων, Stanley would have ἀγγέλλων and Porson ἀγγελῶν, without improving the passage. The verb ἐξικνεῖσθαι properly signifies *pervenire*, i. e., "to arrive at, reach," and is usually followed by the accusative of the place without a preposition. So Eurip. Med. 678; Iphig. Aul. 1557 and in Homer invariably. Here, however, it = *advenire*, "to arrive, come," as Soph. Oed. Col. 349; Ajax 1043; Elect. 387; Aeschyl. Enmen. 928. "And who of messengers (i. e., what messenger) could come with such rapidity?"

V. 282. φρυκτός here designates the place where the fire-signal was kindled, "the signal-post, station." The ἄγγαροι were Persian messengers, stationed at certain distances from each other, always in readiness to convey the despatches of the monarch throughout the kingdom. The manner, in which this was done, is described by Herodotus 8, 98; Xenophon Cyrop. 8, 6, 9.

The reading of all the MSS. and early editions is ἀγγέλου πυρός. As, however, in the quotations of this passage by Suidas, by the Grammaticus of the Etymologicum Magnum, p. 7, 16, and by Eustathius, p. 1854, 26, the word ἀγγάρου occurs, and that too for the purpose of its own explanation, its reädoption was recommended by Canterus and Wesseling, and it is now recognized, e. g., by Schütz, Blomfield, Hermann and others, as the primitive reading. Eustathius remarks: λέξις φανερῶς Περσική. τοιοῦτον δὲ τὸ τῶν φανῶν. κυρίως δὲ κατὰ Αἴλιον Διονύσιον ἄγγαροι οἱ ἐκ διαδοχῆς γραμματοφόροι. οἱ δὲ αὐτοί, φησί, καὶ ἀστάνδαι Περσικῶς. It must be confessed, however, that the sense remains essentially the same, whether we adopt the lection of the MSS. or the emendation of Wesseling. Nay, a close inspection of the passages of the Grammatici might even give rise to the suspicion, that they copied the word (and perhaps the error) from each other.

V. 283. Ἴδη μὲν κ. τ. λ. Supply ἔπεμπεν σέλας, Mount Ida then was the first φρυκτός.—Ἑρμαῖον λέπας. Sophoc. Philoct. 1431 has Ἑρμαῖον ὄρος, to which the Scholiast

adds: *δύναται πάντα τὰ ὄρεα Ἕρμαια καλεῖσθαι, ὅτι νόμος ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὄρειος ὁ Ἑρμῆς. Ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ἑρμαῖον οὕτως ἐν Λήμνῳ καλούμενον.* The word *λέπας* is defined *ὄρους ἀπόκρασμα*, i. e., "cliff, promontory," to be distinguished from *λεπάς*, a species of univalve muscle. Cf. Ammon. de different. vocabb. *s. v.* So Eurip. Herc. Fur. 120 has *πρὸς πετραῖον λέπας*, and Phoen. 24 *ἐς Κιθαιρῶνος λέπας*. The same word in the same sense occurs in Androm. 205; Rhes. 283, 918; Bacch. 666; Helen 1092.

V. 284. *πανόν* is restored by Casaubon from Athenaeus 15, p. 700: *πρότερος δὲ τούτων Αἰσχύλος ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι μέμνηται τοῦ πανοῦ*, and adopted by the majority of editions. That it is the same, however, as the *φανόν* of the MSS. we learn from Photius, who derives it from *φαίνειν* "*κατα μεταβολὴν τοῦ φ.*" He defines it *δέσμη κληματίδων*, "a faggot, torch or brand" made of brushwood and adds *φανόν* as the more recent Attic form. The Scholiast to Aristoph. Pax 841 says, that both forms were used promiscously by the Tragic writers: *φασι λέγειν . . . . τὰς δὲ λαμπάδας τοὺς τραγικοὺς φανοὺς ἢ πανοὺς διὰ τοῦ π̄.* Euripides has *πανός* in Ion. 194; 1293, and in Alcm. fragm. XIII. The *φανόν* of Aristoph. Lysist. should, according to Photius, be *πανόν* likewise.

V. 285. *Ἀθῷον*, instead of the *Ἄθωον* of the MSS., I adopt after Blomfield and Hermann, on the authority of Eustathius p. 358, who maintains that this adjective, being derived from *Ἄθως*, should be a perispomenon after the analogy of *ἥρως, ἡρῷος; γάλως, γαλῷος*, &c. That mount Athos was sacred to Jove, and that the god was thence called *Ζεὺς Ἄθφος* by some, by others *Ζεὺς Ἀθῷος* (or *Ἀθῴος*) we learn from the same author (cited by Hermann). It was properly the extreme summit of the promontory Akte or the peninsula Chalcidice and is now called Agios Oros or Monte Santo. Sophoc. Thamyr. fragm. 3 has *Θρῇσσαν σκοπιὰν Ζηνὸς Ἀθώου.*

V. 286–289. This spirited and highly poetical passage has been the subject of much dispute, and the most unwarrantable changes have been made in the text by the different editors, in order to suit their several interpretations.

A closer inspection, however, will show that the lection of the most reliable MSS. and early editions is not only capable of being defended by parallel passages, but that it makes by far the best sense and is in perfect accordance with the genius of the poet. The subject is *ἰσχύς*, with which *πεύκη* stands in opposition. To *ὑπερτελής*, the predicate, we supply *ἐστί* or *ἐγένετο*, and then the import is as follows: "And bounding passed beyond, o'erspreading all the sea, the pleasure-speeding torch's might, the pine, announcing, like another sun, its gold-out streaming blazes to Mekistos' watch." It now remains to justify this rendering, word for word, in the order of the verses.

V. 286. *ὑπερτελήσ τε.* This word occurs in a similar sense Sophoc. Trach. 36, *νῦν δ' ἡνίκ' ἄθλων τῶνδ' ὑπερτελὴς ἔφυ*, where the Schol. explains it by *ὑπὲρ τὸ τέλος γέγονεν*; and again by *ὑπέρτερος αὐτῶν ἐστιν, ἐγκρατὴς καὶ ὑπεράνω*, "now that he (sc. Hercules) has passed beyond the limits of these toils, or now that he has risen superior to them." So below v. 350 *ὑπερτελέσαι*, and the adjective alone occurs as here, Euripid. Ion. 1549. That we are at liberty to supply *ἐστί*, *ἔφυ* or some such copula, is evident from the passage of Sophocles just quoted, and it is therefore not necessary to change the word into *ὑπερτελεῖ*, as Blomfield wishes it. The conciseness of the ellipsis may even be regarded as adding energy to the expression. Cf. Kühner § 417. The signification then is either: "And onward went beyond the goal (i. e., the limit of the strait) &c., or: and upward soared aloft, &c., "altissime eminens," Hermann. The former of these is adopted by Hesychius, who, probably with reference to this passage, has *ὑπερτελής· ὑπὲρ τὸ τέλος ἀφικομένη*.

The full meaning of *νωτίσαι*, which the Scholiast gives but imperfectly by his *ὑπερβῆναι*, and Blomfield by *per dorsum ire*, is found in Porson's note to Euripid. Phoen. 657, where Hesychius explains the *ἐνώτισεν* by *τὰ νῶτα περιεσκέπασεν*. It is, therefore, not simply "to pass over the back," i. e., as we say over the bosom) of the sea, but "to cover it, diffuse itself all over it." The word occurs in a similar

sense in Eurip. Herc. Fur. 362 ed. Pflugk, ubi cf. note. Its peculiar application here may have been suggested by the frequent Homeric *εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης*, where *νῶτα* = our "expanse, surface, bosom." Cf. Passow sub voce.

V. 287. *ἰσχύς* has needlessly been changed into *ἰσχύν* by Blomfield, for the purpose of connecting it with *ὥστε νωτίσαι*. The nom. is by far the best. It occurs moreover in all the MSS. and likewise in the Scholiast's explanation *μεγίστη πεύκη ἰσχὺς πυρός*. From this we should infer that *ἰσχύς* here is the substratum of the flame, its support, and therefore correctly put in apposition with *πεύκη*. In both these words the cause is put for the effect, and by an audacious poetical license, of which Aeschylus alone could have become guilty, the *supporter* of the flame, the *pine itself* (lighted, to be sure!) is said to travel onward, instead of the blazing light that issued from its conflagration!

πορευτοῦ is here active, as verbal adjectives in *τός* sometimes are. Cf. Kühner § 90, Anm. 2. It would be idle here to make it denote a *necessity* or *propriety*, for which the Greeks use the proper form *πορευτέος*, as Eurip. Iphig. Aul. 1016; Hercul. 730.—*πρὸς ἡδονήν* is to be connected with *πορευτοῦ*. It denotes the end for which the light is speeding onw..., or the effect which it is going to produce: *ita ut voluptatem afferat.* So Prom. 481; Eurip. Iphig. Aul. 1022; Sophoc. Elect. 421. and Trachin. 179 we find in a similar manner *πρὸς χαρὰν λόγων*, which the Scholiast correctly explains by *πρὸς χάριν ἀπαγγελοῦντα, λόγων ἡδονὴν διδόντα*. The torch is thus said to be a messenger of joy to those beyond the strait, or, as I rendered "pleasure-speeding." This is decidedly more rational than Hermann's *πρὸς ἡδονὴν πεύκης, luxuriante pinu*, to say nothing of the violence done to the text by this connection. I should myself like to read *πεύκης* instead of *πεύκη*, not however for the purpose of linking it to *πρὸς ἡδονήν*, but rather to connect *πεύκης τὸ χρυσοφεγγές . . . . σέλας*. The change however is not necessary.

V. 288. *ὥς τις ἥλιος, like a sun, like some (other,* or, *a second) sun.* Cf. v. 55, *ἤ τις Ἀπόλλων, κ. τ. λ.*

V. 289. The last difficulty of this sentence is contained

in *Μακίστου σκοπάς*. This is the lection of the earliest and best authorities, and undoubtedly the true one. Yet still the various editions, partly to avoid an apparent grammatical anomaly and partly on account of the *ὁ δέ* of the following verse, have changed *σκοπάς* into *σκοπαῖς* (Turnebus and Victorius), into *σκοποῖς* (Blomfield after Schütz), into *σκοπᾶς* (an error of Stephanus), and lastly with most plausibility into *σκοπῷ* (Hermann). The double accusative after *παραγγείλασα*, can, however, be defended and *σκοπάς* may be resolved into *εἰς* or *πρὸς σκοπάς*, or rather it may stand as the accusative in expressions like *λέγειν τί τινα*, or like the Homeric *βάζειν τί τινα* of Iliad V, 170; IX, 58; XVI, 207. Cf. Kühner § 559 and 560. In regard to Makistos, it has been strangely contended by Heath, that this is not the name of a mountain, but that of a man. This hallucination arose from the *ὁ δέ*, &c., of the following verse, which that commentator did not understand. The context compels us to assign to Makistos his proper place in the series of mountain-stations here enumerated. With respect to its geographical position, concerning which there has been some difficulty, Hermann remarks: "Lesbi montem Macistum memorat Plinius Hist. Nat. 5, 39, (140). Habuit etiam Triphylia montem altum cui nomen fuit Macistum, memoratum a Strabone 8, p. 346, in quo urbs fuit Macistus, de qua Stephanus Byzantius. Aeschylo qui mons hic dictus est, *situs ille, ut ordo locorum monstrat, in Euboea*, masculino genere *Μάκιστος* videtur appellatus fuisse."

V. 290–291. By the *ὁ δέ* of this verse we may either understand *ὁ Μάκιστος*, "mons quem quasi genium dicit poeta speculatores excitantem" (Klausen); or, perhaps better, the *ὁ σκοπός* implied in the *σκοπάς* of the last verse. There is, therefore, no necessity for regarding Makistos as a man, or for making any of those changes in *σκοπάς*, which we have indicated above, much less for reading *οἱ δ' οὔτ' ἔμελλον κ. τ. λ.*, as Schütz conjectures. The negation expressed by *οὔτε .... οὐδέ* belongs both to the participles and to the verb *παρῆκεν*. The *οὐδέ* instead of the (more common) second *οὔτε* has an augmentative force: *neque vero, nor yet.*

Kühner § 743, *d.*—The *ἀφρασμόνως* (which Turnebus has *ἀφράσμων ὡς*) is manifestly the same as the *ἀφραδμόνως* of Pers. 390, which the Scholiast defines: *A. ἁπλῶς, ἀδιδάκτως*; *B. ἀνεπιστημόνως, inconsiderate, secorditer, incuriose.*—*Παρῆκεν* with the negative = *non praetermisit, non neglexit*, i. e., he punctually or faithfully performed. "He, neither slow, nor heedlessly o'ercome with sleep, did not neglect (performed at once) his part of messenger." This seems to be better than to render without the negative: "He sent ahead (forwarded) the part of messenger," i. e., to the one next in order, as Hermann and others prefer to have it.

V. 292–293. The order is *ἑκὰς δὲ μολόν φρυκτοῦ φῶς, κ. τ. λ.* With respect to the situation of Messapium, there are three different accounts. 1st. the Scholiast's: *Μεσάπιον ὄρος μεταξὺ Εὐβοίας καὶ Βοιωτίας.* 2nd. Strabo's, 9, p. 405, *ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἀνθηδονίᾳ Μεσσάπιον ὄρος ἐστίν, ἀπὸ Μεσσάπου.* This statement, which makes it a mountain of Boeotia, is adopted by Servius ad Virg. Aeneid. VIII, 9. Cf. also Pausanias 9, 22.—3rd. that of Photius: *ὄρος Εὐβοίας· ἀπὸ Μεσάπου τοῦ μετοικήσαντος εἰς Ἰταλίαν*, which is also that of Stephanus Byzantius. With the Macedonian mountain of the same name mentioned by Aristotle, Hist. Anim. 9, 32, we have of course nothing to do here. The authority of Strabo and Pausanias is preferred by Müller, who (Orchomenos, p. 18) remarks: "Mount Mesapion, abounding in springs and stately groves, (is situate) on the Euboean sea. At the foot of it lies the town Anthedon." Cf. his map of Boeotia.—The verb *σημαίνει* is here used intransitively: "imparts the signal," as Sophoc. Antig. 1208, *δεσπότῃ χρέοντι σημαίνει μολών*; and Herod. 8, 11. *τοῖς Ἕλλησι ὡς ἐσήμηνε.*

V. 294. *οἱ δ' ἀντέλαμψαν, κ. τ. λ.* The verb seems to have a factative sense here: "But they returned the blaze (caused it to shine in return) and sped it onward." Schneider compares v. 749, *Δίκα δὲ λάμπει μὲν ἐν δυσκάπνοις δώμασιν*, Dike *causes her light to shine* in smoky habitations.

V. 295. The adjective *γραῖος* (=*γεραιός*) is usually predicated of persons, rarely of things; sometimes of parts of the human body, perhaps in the sense of the English "with-

ered," e. g. Eurip. Phoen. 101, *γεραίαν χεῖρα*; Med. 1209, *γεραιὸν δέμας*; Suppl. 183, *γεραιὰ μελή*. This I hold to be its signification here, so that *γραία ἐρείκη*=aged, e. i., dry, withered heath or broom, such as is most easily ignited. That we are to explain the *γραίας ἀκάνθης πάππος* of Sophoc. fragm. 748 in the same way is evident from the definition of Hesychius: *πάππος, ἄκανθα, ἐπὰν γεράσῃ*, and Klausen's "*γραία* de *pallido* ericae *colore* dictum" is not sustained by any proof. To inorganic objects in the sense of *old*, the word is applied, e. g., by Theocritus 15, 16, *γραιᾶν ἀποτίλματα πηρᾶν, veterum perarum lacinias*; and *γέρων* in the same manner. *id.* 7, 17, *γέρων πέπλος* (like the *charta anus* of Catullus 67, 46, and the *terra anus* of Pliny Hist. Nat. 17, 5. Homer Odyss. 22, 184 has *γέρον σάκος*, an old shield. Cf. Wüstemann ad. Theocrit. 7, 17.)—*θωμόν*=*σωρόν* (Schol.).

V. 297. On *δίκην* cf. note to v. 224. On the *λέπας* of the following verse cf. note to v. 274. The plain watered by the Asopos is in the southern part of Boeotia. Cf. Müller's Orchomenos pp. 18, 19, and 476. It is again mentioned by our poet in Pers. 757, *ἔνθα πεδίον Ἀσωπὸς ῥοαῖς ἄρδει*.

V. 299. *πομποῦ* stands here adjectively, as in v. 123 *πομπούς τ' ἀρχάς*, and = the *ἀγγάρου πυρός*, of v. 273, *ignis ignem deducentis, sive transmittentis*. The *τηλέπομπον* of the following verse is either *longe missam* (sc. flammam), or else *late splendentem*, as Schütz correctly has it.

V. 301. *πλέον καίουσα, κ. τ. λ.* kindling it brighter than those named before. The Scholiast's *ἢ τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος* seems, however, to refer *καίουσα* in a neuter sense to *φρουρά*, blazing brighter than those named before. As to *πλέον*, it may either be taken as an adverb, or as an adjective agreeing with *φάος*. It denotes augmentation not of number only, but also of magnitude, power, intensity, &c. Here then it =brighter, more intensely.

V. 302. According to the Etymol. Magn. p. 384, 32 and Hesychius s. v., lake Gorgopis, anciently *Ἐσχατιῶτις*, was situated on the Corinthian isthmus. The derivation of its name is said to be *ἀπὸ Γόργης τῆς Μεγαρέως θυγατρός, γυναικὸς Κορίνθου, ἥτις ἀκούσασα τὸν τῶν παίδων φόνον, περιαλγὴς γενομένη, ἑῤῥιψεν ἑαυτὴν εἰς τὴν λίμνην*.

V. 303. The *Αἰγίπλαγκτος* (=*undis pulsus*, according to Müller) is by the Scholiast said to have been a mountain of Megaris.

V. 304. As its derivation indicates, *θεσμός* (from *τίθημι*) designates whatever is constituted, ordained, appointed by authority, human or divine, e. g., *a law*, *custom*, &c., more rarely, in a concrete and collective sense, a body of individuals appointed for some special purpose or invested with some particular power, such as *magistrates*, *judges*, &c. The latter is unquestionably its meaning in Eumen. 441, *δικαστὰς . . . . . θεσμὸν τὸν εἰς ἅπαντ' ἐγὼ θήσω χρόνον*, where the *δικασταί* and *θεσμός* are made synonymes, and where the Scholiast, under the same conviction, adds his explanatory *διετέλεσε γὰρ τὸ Ἀρειοπαγιτικὸν συνέδριον*. In the same manner then the *θεσμός* here may be the duly appointed watch (collectively) of the signal-station. This seems to be evident, moreover, from the plural verb *πέμπουσι* of the following verse. To this must be added, however, that Hesychius gives one more definition of the word. He says *θεσμούς· νόμους θείους, ἢ τὰς συνθέσεις τῶν ξύλων*, *lignorum strues*, an interpretation of the passage adopted by Spanheim.

μὴ χαρίζεσθαι is the reading of all the MSS. with the exception of one (the Farn. which has *δὴ χαρίζεσθαι*), and I have ventured to retain it in the text in spite of the objections of nearly all the editors, whose emendations do not appear to me to have improved the passage. The difficulty seems to have arisen from a misapprehension in regard to the grammatical construction of this verb, which when it signifies to favor, or indulge is well known to require the dative of the person favored or of the thing indulged in, and when it signifies to favor in the sense of offering freely, or presenting, is known to require the accusative or the partitive genitive of the object bestowed. This is its ordinary construction in Homer (where it frequently occurs,) as well as in the Attic writers of a latter date. Applied to this place, however, there seems to be no sense in it. But Passow admits that sometimes the dative of the person is

omitted, and that the verb may stand *absolutely* with the same meaning. Moreover, from Iliad xiii, 633, *οἷον δὴ ἄνδρεσσι χαρίζεαι ὑβριστῆσιν*, it is evident that it may signify to favor in a culpable sense. Hence I render: "Urged the appointed signal-guard to show no favor in regard to the fire (or more briefly, *not to spare the fire*)," h. e., to comply promptly and strictly with the requirements of the law that regulated the transmission of the signal, as is the duty of a *θεσμός*. In all this there seems to be a distant allusion to the original signification of the word *θεσμός*, as used by the poet in the passage of the Eumenides above quoted, in the sense of *judge* or *magistrate*, in whom the *χαρίζεσθαι* would be a criminal dereliction from duty. In this interpretation I am supported by none of the editors, with the exception of Haupt, who without any further explanation gives *non parcere* as his definition of *μὴ χαρίζεσθαι*. Casaubon and Stanley read *μοι χαρίζεσθαι*, in imitation of the *ἐμοί* of v. 307.

This is adopted by Voss, who translates: *Trieb er zur Pflicht, willfährig mir zu seyn mit Gluth*, urged he the duty, to supply me readily with fire. But this *μοι*, although it completely removes every difficully with respect to the construction, is harsh and improbable. The same remark applies to the *νιν χαρίζεσθαι* of Vossius and Pearson, to favor him with fire, to impart it freely to him, which personifies the subject *φάος*. Stanley "secundis curis" emends *μῆχαρ ἵζεσθαι, excitavit legis observatorem, ut consideret subsidium ignis*. This conjecture led Wellauer, who still was anxious to make something of *χαρίζεσθαι*, to coin the new word *μηχαρίζεσθαι* from *μῆχαρ*, after the analogy of *θεναρίζω* from *θέναρ*, which new word is provisionally adopted by Passow and defended by Schneider. But why should the watch be roused to make his preparations respecting the fire? Must it not be supposed that such preparations had been made long before and that the signal could be conveyed with lightening-speed? Heath was the first, who ventured to discard the *χαρίζεσθαι* altogether and to substitute *μὴ χατίζεσθαι*. So do ed. Glasgow, Schütz,

Porson, Blomfield, and Hermann after them: *Hortabatur, ut ne desiderari paterentur ignem accendi jussum*, from which Humboldt likewise renders: *Dass nimmer fehle meiner Fackelreih' Gesetz.* But the legitimacy of the passive voice of this verb, suspected by Blomfield and Bergk, has not been satisfactorily established, nor do I understand the "non dici hic θεσμὸς οὐ χατίζει πυρός, sed πυρὸς θεσμὸς οὐ χατίζει, *non desideratur*," which Hermann offers in its defense. From all this the reader will conclude, that the emendations are as difficult, as the lection of the MSS., and that consequently the latter may be supposed to contain the true sense of the passage.

V. 305. ἀνδαίοντες=ἀναδαίοντες. The prepositions ἀνά, κατά, παρά, both singly and in composition, often drop the final vowel before consonants. So ἀνδεσμός, ἀνστάς, παρστᾶσα, καδδῦσαι etc. This elision is chiefly Doric and epic. Cf. Kühner § 34.—μένει here, as ἰσχύς of v. 278 =fuel, supply of fuel, the effect for the cause: Kindling with unsparing (abundant, lavish) supply of power &c.

V. 306. πώγωνα λέγει τὴν εἰς ὀξὺ λήγουσαν ἀκμὴν τοῦ πυρός. ἐκ τούτου ὠνομάσθη παρὰ τοῖς μετεωρολόγοις πωγωνίας ἀστήρ. Schol. The huge beard of a flame is then so called from its tapering conoïdal shape. A similar metaphor is the ἐμπύρους τ' ἀκμάς of Eurip. Phoen. 1261, which Klotz renders *firmas et aequabiles ignis altitudines et quasi florem flammae;* and Seneca Orest. 309 seq. has: clarus ignis . . . . *summam* in auras fusus *explicuit comam.* So we speak of a pencil of light, the tail of a comet, and the Germans say both *Feuerbart* and *Feuerschweif.* Photius less correctly has πώγωνα πυρός=τὴν ἀναφορὰν τοῦ πυρός.

V. 306–308. καὶ Σαρωνικοῦ .... φλέγουσαν. The feminine φλέγουσαν is to be referred to the genitive φλογός, and its construction is to be accounted for in the same manner as the λαγίναν γένναν .... βλαβέντα of v. 119. g. v.—καί=*etiam.* Before ὑπερβάλλειν we supply ὥστε, and connect it with πέμπουσιν. The order then is ὥστε καὶ ὑπερβ. Σαρων. πορθ. κ. τ. λ. "So that in its onward blaze it strikes beyond the far-seen heights of the Saronic gulf."

The reading of the MSS., of Robertellus and Victorius is *κάτοπτρον πρῶν'*, which Bernhardy Wissensch. Synt. p. 50 defends, in the sense of *Spiegelfläche*, mirror-surface. Against such a conjunction of two substantives, of which one stands as the attributive determination of the other, there can be no objection, and to the places cited by Bernhardy there may be added the *πομποῦ πυρός* of v. 290. But it is extremely doubtful, whether *πρών* is ever used in the sense of frith, sea, or surface of any kind, the *ἅλιον πρῶνα* of Pers. 109 and 128 being susceptible of a different explanation (cf. Passow s. v., and Schütz ad loc. and Excursus II ad Agamem.) Its ordinaryand most obvious signification is any projecting eminence generally, chiefly of mountains, here a projection of the sea-coast, promontory. Hesychius has *πρώονας· ὀρῶν ἐξοχάς*; and again *πρώονες· οἱ ἐκνενευκότες τόποι ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν.* Photius *πρῶνες· ὀρῶν ἐξοχαί, βουνοί.* We must therefore discard *κάτοπτρον*, until a better explanation, than that of Bernhardy is given, and adopt *κάτοπτον*, the emendation of Canterus and others. This the Scholiast makes = *κατόψιον*, conspicuous, or visible from above (here from the heights of Aegiplanctus). But if you prefer to retain *κάτοπτρον*, I propose, as another explanation, to render the substantives separately, making the verb in a pregnant govern both: So as, darting over (*ὑπέρ*) the mirror-surface of the Saronic gulf, to strike its promontory marge, still onward blazing.

V. 308. *ἔστ' .... εὖτ'* is the reading proposed by Hermann in his posthumous edition of the poet; *εἶτ' .... ἔστ'*, of Stanley, Heath, ed. Glasgow, Porson and Schütz; *εἶτ' .... ἔστ'* of Blomfield. But there is not sufficient ground for changing the *εἶτ' .... εἶτ'* of the best authorities (Med. Farn. Bess. Plor. Turneb. Vict.), and whatever Hermann may say to the contrary, Wellauer's remark is just, when he says: "*εἶτα* cum vi quadem repetitum videtur, ad exprimendum laetitiam quod nuntius jam ad eam pervenerit stationem, quae Atridarum aedibus proxima est," nor is it necessary to suppose with Blomfield that any thing is lost in the text.

V. 309. *Ἀραχναῖον αἶπος· ὄρος Ἄργους.* Schol., and Pausanias II, 25, *ἔστι δὲ ὄρος ὑπὲρ τῆς Λήσσης τὸ Ἀραχναῖον.* The comp. *ἀστυγείτων* occurs Eurip. Hipp. 1156 *ἀστυγείτονας πόλεις.*

V. 311. *οὐκ ἄπαπτον· οὐ ξένον ἀλλὰ συγγενές.* Schol. "not destitute of the ancestry of the Idaean fire," i. e., linked to it by descent, not undescended from it. "This verse and all the seqq. to v. 1062 are wanting in MSS. Med. and Guef., and likewise in the editions of Aldus, Robertellus and Turnebus. Victorius was the first to make up the *lacuna* from such sources, as he had access to. The few MSS. that contain the entire play, e. g., the Farnesian and the Florentine, appear to have undergone the recension of Triklinios." Schneider.

V. 312. It is scarcely worth while to make *νόμοι* = the *θεσμός* of v. 295 (in the sense of *station*), as Schneider does. It signifies rather the "prescribed part, the alloted duty" of the torch-bearers (from *νέμω*).—*τοιοίδ'* may be rendered adverbally: "Thus, in this manner."—*ἕτοιμοι* is not "ready," but "accomplished, performed," perhaps with the subordinate idea of promptness. "Thus promptly were the parts of the torch-victors (all) performed, fulfilled each by the other in his turn." As the poet in verse 273 compared the transmission of the fire-signal to the expeditious courier-arrangement of the Persians (between which and the torch-races of the Greeks Herodotus 8, 98 has likewise instituted a comparison), so here he makes an equally apt allusion to the *λαμπαδεδρομία*, well-known to his countrymen. This was a public spectacle of a gymnastic description given on certain festivals, more especially on the Promethean, the Panathenaean and the Hephaistean, in honor of the respective divinities. Vid Schol. ad Aristoph. Ran. 1087. The torches employed on these occasions were often of a very ornamental kind, and the whole affair was usually attended with great display and expense. To be a successful competitor in one of these contests, or, in other words, to be a *λαμπαδηφόρος* (Hesychius has *ὁ νικήσας λέγεται λαμπαδηφόρος*), was considered an honorable and

manly achievement, as is evident from Aristoph. Ran. 1079 seqq. and Vesp. 1203. From the passage of Herodotus. already cited and from Pausanias 1, 30, Schneider concludes that "there were two kinds of torch races, one in which several competitors were accustomed to run at the same time, and when the one, who reached the goal first with his torch still burning, was considered victor, and a second, in which the competitors were stationed at certain distances from each other, where fires were probably kindled, by which accidentally extinguished torches might be lighted and the proper distances measured. The first runner was to carry his torch to the second, the second to the third, and so on. Those only were pronounced victors who reached the station next to them with torches still burning. The latter is the one to whioh allusion is made in the passage under consideration." In regard to the truth of this distinction, however, I must frankly confess my doubts. From the Schol. ad Aristoph. fragm. 105 and ad Ran. 1093 we learn that to be the last runner was considered a disgrace, and that such a one was surrounded by the boys and struck with the palm of their hands (*πλατείαις χερσίν*). The blows thus inflicted were called *Κεραμεικαὶ πληγαί* from the place where such gymnastics were practised at Athens. Now if it were true, that there were two kinds of these races (which Schneider has failed to establish satisfactorily), then the poet must assuredly have confounded the two. For in the next verse he says that "the last runner," instead of being abused by boys, as was the custom, "was victor (in this particular instance namely) as well as the first."

New York. G. J. A.

Art. V.—MOHAMMEDANISM IN ITS RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY.

[A SKETCH.]

Near six centuries had elapsed since Christianity had first reared its standard in the world as "an ensign unto the nations." Armed with its mysterious power over the hearts of men, it had carried its conquests far and wide into the strongholds of ancient bigotry and superstition. Before it Judaism had shrunk into a dry and barren sect, and the splendid Heathenism of Greece and Rome had lost its spell and gradually faded from the earth. Pursuing still its victorious career, it was now entering successfully upon another and wider field in undertaking the great work of winning from barbarism and enlisting under its banner, the numerous Germanic tribes, that had already assumed such an important place on the scene of Western and Northern Europe. Thus, virtually, it seemed already to have made good its claim to be the absolute and universal religion; when suddenly the watchword of a *new* Faith broke upon the ear of the world, likewise laying claim to universality, and with terrible rapidity apparently making good that claim.

In a strange and almost unknown quarter had the rival creed sprung up. In the heart of wild Arabia appeared the remarkable man who came forward as its founder and who constitutes its central figure. The subject no doubt of various spiritual exercises and conflicts which were nurtured to a morbid excess by his protracted meditations in the cave of Mt. Hara; the victim probably of some form of spasmodic disease simulating trance; and possessing in full measure that vividness of imagination tinctured with grotesqueness, which is such a marked trait in the oriental character, we need not marvel that Mohammed came final-

ly to see his mental states projected into outward visions and forms, and to believe himself, through the angel Gabriel, the favored recipient of divine communications, the nature and purport of which, brought him, at last, to the conviction that he was the Chosen Instrument of the Most High, for the promulgation of a new religion, a prime article in whose creed was to be the recognition of himself as God's prophet, and the implicit submission to his teachings due him in this character. "There is no God but God, and Mohammed is the prophet of God," were words that sounded the key-note of his system.

Obloquy and derision met the first announcement of his mission and the assertion of his prophetic claims; and after a series of public and private persecutions, he was finally forced to fly his native Mecca, and to seek an asylum at Medina, which thus came to be a sacred city in the eyes of his followers. This flight, which occurred A. D. 622, is known as the Hegira, and from it dates the commencement of the Moslem era. On the way his retinue, which consisted, at first, of only a few faithful attendants from Mecca, gained large accessions from fresh converts; so that it swelled to the character of a triumphal procession by the time he reached his destination. Thus finding himself surrounded with a host of enthusiastic and devoted followers, he now proclaimed the *sword* to be the heaven-ordained instrument for the spread of religion; and the work of converting his countrymen, assumed, from this time forward, the form of various military expeditions, which, in a few years, resulted in the establishment of the new Creed throughout Arabia, as the national Faith, and in carrying its fame to the ears of surrounding nations. But the aspirations and pretensions of the prophet could not now rest at this point. Visions of wider triumphs of his Faith, and more brilliant successes of his arms flitted before him, and already in his own life-time an ominous beginning was made in that fierce crusade against nationalities of other creeds, which, under his successors, carried terror to the heart of Europe and Asia.

Some of the tenets of the new Faith, received as they were with absolute credence by its devotees, were especially calculated to fire and feed the military spirit of these Ishmaelitish crusaders, and to make them invincible before their foes. "Every thing," taught the prophet, "has its appointed time which is not to be hastened or avoided." So that if a soldier fell in the fight, it was no hastening of death, but the thread of his life would have been snapt asunder at the identical instant, though he were in the midst of his family in peace. And—what particularly filled the imagination of the Moslem warriors—to those who fell in the battles for the Faith, was the promise of an immediate entrance into Paradise, and the full fruition of all its felicities, the voluptuous character of which must have wrought powerfully on the fancy of these impassioned sons of the desert. Thus on the one hand, rendered indifferent to the casualities of war by their fatalistic creed, and, on the other, led positively to court death, on account of the fancied delights to which it was the immediate passage, and burning with a fanatical zeal for the spread and triumph of their Faith, we need not much wonder that the soldiers of the prophet and his successors, pushed their conquests with such startling success and rapidity. Within less than a century they had carried their victorious arms northward and eastward over the ancient seats of Asiatic power and civilization, had threatend Constantinople, overrun northern Africa, crossed over into Spain and borne the crescent to the Pyrenees, every where announcing and enforcing the threefold option of "the Koran, the tribute, or the sword." On attempting, however, to spread their devastating swarms over France and thence to Italy, they were met in the year 732 by the hosts of Christendom under Charles Martel, on the plain of Tours, and suffered an irretrievable defeat, which drove them again behind the Pyrenees, and Europe was saved to Christianity and civilization.

In its creed, as detailed in the Koran, Mohammedanism presents a strange medley of Pagan, Jewish and Christian

elements. The old Arabian Paganism, essentially rude and gross in its character, seems to have furnished the large carnal element in the new Faith, as exhibited in its bloody appeal to the sword as the grand instrument of conversion, and in that sensual conception of the future life which is such a revolting feature of the Koranic eschatology; and again the legalization of polygamy, sanctioned by the example of the prophet himself, to which is due in so large a degree the social degradation of Mohammedan countries. The Jewish and Christian elements incorporated in the Koran, seem to have been derived from the imperfect and corrupted forms of Christianity and Judaism then current in Arabia, and from the legends and traditions, Mohammed had gleaned in his various caravan journeys. The Jewish element crops out most prominently in the rigid monotheism of the prophet, and in the furious iconoclastic zeal of himself and his followers against every form of idolatry. "There is no God but God," was the stern unvarying utterance against Polytheism and all image-worship. But it is a formal sterile monotheism. The Allah of the Koran is not the *Elohim* of the Hebrew Scriptures,—is not, like the latter, while not losing the idea of unity, suggestive of that *plural* fulness of Divinity, which, under a clearer revelation, becomes the Triune God of the Christian. From Jewish sources also, Mohammed seems to have derived his cosmogony. From the same quarter circumcision and abstinence from swine's flesh seem to have been adopted into his system; and from Jewish tradition and practice, most probably, he was led to lay that emphasis on prayer, fasting and alms-giving, which give them such prominence among his tenets, and in the institutions and observances of the faithful. Like the Jews, also, he acknowledged in Abraham a common father and patriarch, admitted the "divine legation" of Moses, and recognized the prophetic mission of some others of the Old Testament worthies. It was by a succession of prophets, in different ages, according to Mohammed, that God had made known his will to men; and his own peculiar dignity and prerog-

ative, consisted in the fact that he was the last and greatest in this prophetic succession—*the* prophet par excellence.

Finally in his system, we detect a Christian element, or at least a subordinate recognition of Christianity, in his giving the Gospels a place among the "Heavenly Books," and in his admitting the "Son of Mary" in his list of prophets, as the greatest next to himself, and in the important rôle he assigns him at the end of the world, in the overthrow of Antichrist. His position here still, however, is strictly subordinate as in the end he but subserves the universal triumph of Islam.

Mohammedanism and its founder have met, at the hands of more recent investigators, with much more favor and charity than used to be the fashion. The hypothesis of wilful imposture on the part of the prophet, seems no longer tenable. Deducting as largely as we may for ambition and worse motives which have been charged upon him, and which no doubt too often played a part in his schemes, we have still a residuum of earnestness, of zeal, of self-denial, and devoutness of character, the feigning of which, under all the circumstances of the case, is more improbable than their genuineness. Nor can it be denied that his creed, as the national religion of his country, was immeasurably in advance of the Paganism it supplanted. In the place of idolatry and polytheism, it taught, with whatever errors on the side of a too rigid exclusiveness, the great doctrine of the unity of God, and the unlawfulness and impiety of any visible representations of Him. And in its practical operation, it brought to the regulation and improvement of life and conduct, a code of valuable and strictly-enforced moral precepts.

The prophet's own conviction of the reality of his divine mission seems never to have been shaken. "When the angels ask thee who thou art," said he over the open grave of his son, whose death preceded only a short time his own, "When the angels ask thee who thou art, say, 'God is my Lord, the prophet of God was my Father, and my Faith was Islam.'" The strange hallucination followed him to the grave.

It thus seems more consonant with all the facts of the case, and more in harmony with the customary ways of Providence, to suppose him to have been in heart and purpose at least, a true reformer, acting under the persuasion of a divine call, however imperfect may have been his apprehension of Truth, however large a share his own imagination may have had in his supposed revelations, and however mistaken he may have been in regard to the proper means of defending and spreading his Faith.

In a comprehensive view of the subject, in its relations to Christianity, Mohammedanism must also be regarded partly in the light of a judgment on the stagnant and degenerate churches of the east, over whom it flourished so fearfully the fiery sword of persecution. These had lost the chaste fervor of their first love; they had grown worldly and corrupt; had exhausted their strength and substance in fruitless subtilties and endless quarrels, and seemed to have lapsed into a hopeless lethargy, when the fiery visitation came upon them to sift and to try them, separating between a nominal and a genuine Christianity, and leaving them under the hand of God's judgment, till the end of His righteous chastisement should be obtained.

A final and complete estimate of Mohammedanism belongs of course to the future. It is only when its entire race shall have been run, and the end has shown how far it has led the way to an ultimate conversion to the Gospel, that its proper place in history and its true import and purpose in God's providential government, can be fully and finally established. As a worldly power it seems nearly to have played out its part, but as a spiritual power it still holds dominion over more than 150 million souls: and that its vitality as a system of faith is not yet exhausted, is evinced by the fact that it is still occasionally making large conversions among races of inferior culture and civilization, particularly in central Africa, where within no great number of years whole tribes have been gained over to its tenets; and that its ancient fanaticism is not yet extinct, and into how fierce a flame it is still capable of being

kindled, has been frightfully exhibited in those horrors of which India and Syria have just been the theatre. That however it will come at last to a final and complete overthrow, and the Gospel triumph in its place, we, as Christians, cannot for a moment doubt. The "Son of Mary," in the end, will not only prove victor over Antichrist, but also over Islam itself, because He is not only the 'Son of Mary" but also the Son of God.

Mercersburg, Pa. Z. T.

Art. VI.—THE COMING OF CHRIST.

Luke 21: 25, 28, 29, 30.

The Evangelist, St. Matthew, when describing the processional entry of our Saviour into Jerusalem, speaks of Him as King, as founder of the kingdom of Heaven on earth. But only Emperors or Kings enter into a city with ceremonious solemity, and the Gospel applies therefore the prophetic words: "Behold thy king cometh unto thee, tell ye the daughter of Zion," i. e., Israel. Undeniably the Evangelist means here the terrestial, visible Jerusalem and Israel; but the *Church*, as the collective body of saints in heaven and earth, understands by those words the spiritual Israel, and the coming of Christ to the new Jerusalem; and the Apostle admonishes us therefore in the corresponding Epistle, selected by the Episcopal and Lutheran Churches, to awake out of sleep, to cast off the works of darkness, and put on the armour of light, because our salvation draweth nigh; the whole thus being only a paraphrase of the solemn words, wherewith Jesus commenced His redeeming work: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." It was also a natural consequence that upon the intelligence of His first coming another intelligence of His second coming had to follow, namely, of His reappearing on the judgment-day; for we know that in the last day the Lord shall come to judge the quick and the dead. But the words of the Gospel refer both to His first and second coming, seeing that mention is made of what should come to pass before this generation passes away, and thereafter the destruction of the world and the judgment of the world are spoken of. The parable intimates that the kingdom of Heaven is at hand, and we are therefore cautioned against worldly-mindedness by that serious admonition: "Take

heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life," the same sentiment being here reiterated which we have in those grave words of our Lord: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" and this is again an admonition to us to labor and pray that the kingdom of God may come to us, that the kingdom of God from time to time may draw nearer. We should, therefore, take pains to discern the signs of the times, we should have a watchful eye upon all that may hinder the coming of the kingdom of God.

Every prophecy contains three things: *Judgment*, *Admonition*, and *Consolation*. Although on reading this grand and sublime prophecy every one must necessarily feel somewhat in it overwhelming to the human mind, it appears, however, easily, that it begins with that judgment, which should befall Jerusalem, and terminate in the last day, terminate in the consummation of all things, terminate the universal history; and it appears with equal clearness, that a severe sentence is pronounced against all that is an impediment to vital religion, an impediment to the coming of the kingdom of God. The realm of wickedness is described, which tried to prevent the realm of holiness and true piety from making progress, and even ridiculed it as a morose singularity. For what says Christ in this grand prophecy to His disciples: "They shall lay their hands on you, and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues, and into prisons, being brought before kings and rulers for my name's sake." And the pious Christian exclaims still with lamentation and weeping: The same is the course of our time. Torpid security in sin prevails, indifference to true piety prevails, indifference to sanctified affections, unconcernedness for the kingdom of God prevails, unconcernedness for the eternal life prevails; and even as at that time prophets and sage counsellors when endeavoring to cure the prevailing spiritual blindness were not believed, but slain between the temple and the altar, so now; the words of righteousness, temperance and judgment

to come return empty from the lips of God's servants, the frigidity of this mundane life makes their words clay-cold, the tempests of this life blow them away. But what Christ had prophesied should befall the inhabitants of Jerusalem, because they had not known the time of their visitation, because they had despised every exhibition of His divine goodness and mercy, was both exactly and awfully fulfilled when Titus, the son of Vespasian, seventy years after Christ, came with his Roman eagles and his Roman legions, set his colors upon the ramparts, stormed and pillaged Jerusalem, and the magnificent temple, so that not one stone upon another was left that was not thrown down, when both their real and expected glory sunk into fragments, when there was an affliction around them such as was not from the beginning of the creation, when their nationality was broken without hope of restoration, and they were condemned to roam wildly about as pilgrims without home until the termination of the days. But when those terrible things began to come to pass, then, because they had never clung fast to Him, who was their first love, because they had no hope as an anchor of the soul, then did nothing remain for them but anxiety and despondency. But says the book of Judges, so shall all the enemies of God perish, but they that love Him they shall be as the sun, when he goes forth in his might. If we confine all our doing, and all our hoping to the present, perishable world; if the value of this life is measured only by what it may yield to the satisfaction of our terrestial necessities ; if we are so blind and infatuated as to take this world for our portion ; if we forget that we are but pilgrims here, and have no abiding place on earth ; if our hearts have not been influenced by the ineffable power and beauty of the word of God ; if the gentle breeze of Pentecost has not fanned us with its sweet consolation :—then when that hour is at hand, in which the uncertain riches in which only our hearts here have trusted, must be left behind, when we shall be called from this state of change and trial, (that great and solemn hour, which is inevitable and certain,) O then will we be unpre-

pared to meet that great change with Christian resignation, then will we be as were formerly the inhabitants of Jerusalem, then nothing will remain for us but anxiety and despondency. When the sun loses his brigthness to our eyes, when the stars become pale, when those pleasures which here only have comforted us fly away, then are we comfortless, if we have lost sight of the Star of Bethlehem, our first love, if we ourselves have prevented the kingdom of God from coming to us and dwelling in and amongst us. Indeed it is no exaggeration to say, that so corrupt is the world, so lukewarm towards the kingdom of God, that as formerly in Israel when on the very culmination of corruption many expected that Elijah would rise from the grave to ameliorate the prevailing gross perverseness, so we can also easily perceive, that there are grievous signs enough showing that a purification, a judgment must be expected, a new fulfilment of that prayer which our Saviour has enjoined upon us to pray: "Thy kingdom come." But whether this shall be accomplished by another Reformer like Martin Luther, who labored in Elijah's spirit and power, whether this shall be accomplished by one or by many, whether storm, fire, earthquakes, and roaring of the sea and the waves shall also now precede, before the Lord can come in the gentle breezes, and comfort the souls; whether this time is near at hand, or far off, we do not know; this is hidden in God's wonderful counsels past finding out; but this we know that if judgment, severe judgment shall not be pronounced against us then we must pray with Luther: Let thy kingdom, O Lord, also come *by us;* then we must be living stones in that building, in which our great High Priest is the cornerstone, and we must not say as the Jews after the Babylonian exile: "The time is not come, the time is not come that the Lord's house shall be built," but the building of it must be commenced immediately. Towards the consummation of this building we are all, in our day and generation, partial contributors. We are all amongst the outriders of this mighty cavalcade. It will not go back. The kingdom of God will even without our prayer come

with inevitable necessity; there is no stagnation, no retrogression in the order of Providence; but let us pray: Let it also come *by us*. Boys of to-day! Men of to-morrow! This building looks to you to be erected. You must be amongst its architects. Mark that ye speed it! See that it loiter not upon its onward march! Action, action, action—as Demosthenes described eloquence—is the characteristic of our age; let all slow and plodding habits be entirely discarded; erect the Lord's house immediately, *periculum est in mora.*

But this grand prophecy contains also an *admonition*, that we should not observe the signs of the times as idle spectators: for the coming of the kingdom of God, will not descend to us from the skies as the quails to the children of Israel in the wilderness, but it must come from within, from the depth of the hearts and the souls. We should therefore search, if there are not in our own inner man evil signs, false self-conceits, false prophets crying, peace, peace, although there is the reverse of peace. Hence it is that Jesus before finishing this great prophecy exclaims: "Take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be over-charged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life." It is a weight, He means, which presses down our hearts to the very dust, and suffers them not to ascend to God, suffers us not to mould the divine efflatus, the immortal essence, which is committed to us. However much our heart cleaves unto these terrestrial things, at length He will resume His gifts, that we may learn they were only a loan, that we may remember that we are only strangers and pilgrims on earth. But if we even can not hear this with indifference, we ought, as Christians, to hear it without trembling and with quiet resignation surrender ourselves to the hand of God, and rest assured, that He by all these often heavy and bitter trials will make His kingdom draw nearer and nearer to us. No, we shall not as idle spectators observe the signs of the times; for this is also a pitiful sign of our age, that the faith of so many, who call themselves Christians, is only an idle, loose,

wavering frame of mind, a faith without life, without firm confession; but if eruptions of fire, earthquakes and roaring of the sea and the waves should be heard, if the winds should howl, and the torrents come, whereof Jesus speaks, would their loose and wavering faith be to them as a safe anchor-ground; would it be a pillar of fire like that which did shine in advance of the armies of Israel? And it is also therefore that our Lord in this grand prophecy utters threatening to those whose faith is like a garment driven hither and thither by the wind; but to His true believers who have loved His glorious appearing, to those who have joined themselves to Him as to their first love, to those who are living stones in that great building in which He Himself is the great cornerstone, to those He addresses the consoling words: "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." The interpretation of these words of our Saviour is, that when the pleasures of this life fade, when the glory of this world sinks down to the earth like mist, and when at length the prison of the soul bursts, then the true believer perceives his glorious liberty, because his life already here has been hidden in the Redeemer, then he feels that the kingdom of heaven has come nigh.

This grand prophecy contains also *Consolation.* For although our times are evil, it is, praise be to God, not yet so that we in vain need to exclaim with Esau: "Hast thou then not reserved any blessing at all for me, thou Lord of the times, and thou creator of the days?" No, it is not yet so. Many great and pure souls of our time lift up from the very depth of their hearts a deep, a fervent prayer: "Thy kingdom come." Around us are yet living witnesses of the eternal truth, who like John the Baptist are fore-runners of the kingdom of God, and like the immortal reformers battle for raising the Church from her deep ruin. Even amongst the laity are such as believe the testimony, and make the great confession that they stand in need of the higher citizenship, in need of being purified in the

spiritual baptism granted to them by God's free and eternal grace. Blessed be all such, blessed by thy ministers, O God, who faithfully officiate in thy tabernacles, expound thy holy truth, and like the heroes and demi-gods of fabulous antiquity clear the world of monsters—here exterminating a hydra, and there a robber—compel those from the highways and hedges to come in, that thy house may be filled, not by physical power, but by the intrinsic and leading power of the everlasting Gospel. Blessed be all the members of thy church catholic who pray: Let thy kingdom also come by us. But above all blessed be our Lord Jesus Christ, He who cometh through His judgments, He who cometh through hurricanes and earthquakes, but He who also cometh through the refreshing breezes of his Gospel saying: Come to me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, I will give you rest. Yes, there is consolation in this grand prophecy, for wheresoever Jesus first threatens, He always afterwards consoles with all His divine meekness. Where there is a Sinai, there must also be a Golgotha. And how does He console in this prophecy? "Behold the fig-tree," says He, "and all the trees, when they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand." But what is the interpretation of these words dressed in the garb of a parable? The interpretation is: To all of us, who are God's believing children, and Jesus' friends, every severe blow, every heavy and bitter trial is only a new bud, which unfolds itself on the fig-tree of promise, until at length it will be in full blossom, and first then is the bright summer of the kingdom of God at hand. Our noblest and best actions are sown upon a hope of which nothing will perish, but be glorified in the eternal life, where we shall eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of God's paradise. Therefore let us take to heart the conclusion of Jesus' grand prophecy: "Watch ye, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man"—the terrible things, which shall befall all those who prevent the fulfil-

ment of that prayer, which He has commanded us to pray: "Thy kingdom come!"

P. C. S.

Art. V.—CATECHISMS.

CATECHISMS AMONG THE JEWS.

Though the Jewish religion is very ancient, and though the Scriptures acknowledged by them contain many commands pertaining to the early instruction of their children in the ways and worship of God, yet it appears, that through decades of centuries there is not found among them anything like a Catechism for children. John Benedict Carpzo and Jacob Frederick Reinemann, says Koecher, have remarked that previous to the twelfth century after the birth of Christ the Jews had no catechism among them, and that Moses Maimon who lived at that time, was the first one who prepared a work of this character, as his *Schelosch assarah ikkarim*, a. c., Thirteen Articles of Faith, may properly be regarded as a Jewish Catechism. The object had in view by Maimon in the preparation of this work was, it is said, to oppose Christian doctrines and to guard his fellow believers against them. This work was published in Hebrew and Latin, by Sebastian Muenster at Worms, 1529; in Hebrew, by Paul Fagius at Iszna, 1540; and in Spanish by David Cohen de Lara in Amsterdam, 1654. This Catechism has ever since its publication been held in great favor by the Jews, and has generally been printed together with their prayer-books. The boys are required to commit it to memory, and adults almost daily review and repeat it.

This Catechism treats briefly of God,—that He is the Creator and Governor of all things, existing in one essence,

an incorporate being, the first and the last, and is alone to be worshipped; of the verity of the sayings and prophecies of the Prophets and Moses; of the divine origin of the whole Mosaic law; of the unchangableness of this law; of the knowledge which God has of all the acts and thoughts of men; of the rewards of the pious and the punishment of the wicked; of the advent of the Messiah still to be expected; and of the Resurrection of the dead.

Another Jewish Catechism, of a different character, was prepared in the thirteenth century by Rabbi Aaron Levi, surnamed Barcinonensis, to which he has given the title: *Sepher hachinnuch*, a. c., Book of Instruction. This work was published in Venice, 1523, and again in 1601, and also in Amsterdam, 1721. "The author," says Koecher "in this Catechism, explains the six hundred and thirteen commandments of the Jews, with the church-customs connected therewith, from the Scribes and Jewish books in which the customs of their worship are treated."

At the beginning of the sixteenth century Rabbi Abraham Jagel, who in his old age united himself with the Roman Church, prepared a Catechism for his Jewish brethren. It was intended, as the title-page states, "to be to the young for instruction in faith and a godly life, from which well-trodden road those also that are old, must not depart." It was first published in Hebrew, in Venice, 1595, and again in Amsterdam, 1658, and 1675. A Latin translation was published in London, 1679; which edition was republished in Holland, 1690, and in Germany, 1704. It was also published in the German language in Holland, 1658, 1675, and in Germany, 1694, 1714, 1719 1722, 1756; at least five of these editions were new translations.

This Catechism is so constructed that the scholar asks and the teacher answers. It is divided into three parts, according to the three cardinal virtues, faith, hope and love, under each of which the things supposed to belong to these, or grow from them, are treated.

Two other Jewish Catechisms are mentioned by Koecher; but these have never been printed. The Karaites, a

sect among the Jews, have also a Catechism, which in form and arrangement of matter resembles that of Maimon, treating of ten principal articles of the Karaite faith. The same author also mentions eleven Hebrew Catechisms prepared and published by Christians, having for their object to lead Jews to faith in Jesus Christ, and win them to the Christian religion.

CATECHISMS IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

The ancient Church had no Catechisms in questions and answers. Catechumens were instructed by discourses which did not much differ from homiles or sermons. A regular series of such discourses, covering the whole ground of what was then regarded as comprehended in catechetical matter, we have in a work of St. Cyril. They are eighteen in number, delivered by him as Deacon in Jerusalem during Lent previous to A. D., 350, with the addition of five addressed during Easter week to the baptized in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The author of these discourses aims at a systematic discussion of such parts of the Christian faith as are necessary to a proper preparation of the catechumens for Holy Baptism. With this in view he brings forward, in substance,—though in form it was not taught to catechumens,—the points now included in the Apostles' Creed, including also the nature and immortality of the soul, and an account of the canonical books of Scripture. These lectures also largely abound in apologetical and controversial matter, with a view of arming the catechumens against all the various forms of unbelief and heresy as they then prevailed.* From these discourses themselves it is evident that his catechumens were neither very young nor quite untrained in a mental way. These Lectures are, therefore, not characterized by that simplicity which would now be regarded as proper to catechetical instruction imparted to the young.

We have also from St. Augustine, bishop of Hippo, a small work "concerning the catechizing of the uninform-

* Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril. Oxford Ed. p. 5, 6

ed." In this treatise the points that should be particularly insisted upon in catechizing, with directions as to the best mode of conducting catechetical instruction, are presented in continuous discourse. Of a similar nature is "The Great Catechetical Discourse" of Gregory of Nyssa. It is divided into forty chapters, and is intended for the instruction of the catechist rather than the catechumen. Notwithstanding these labors looking to the promotion of catechetical instruction, we find not then, nor yet for centuries later, the production of any Catechism to be placed in the hands of catechumens with a view to having it committed to memory and studied by them.

There are two causes which contributed to the late introduction of Catechisms among the laity of the Church. The first was the doctrine of the *Deciplina arcana*, according to which, what were called mysteries were carefully concealed from all except those who were in full communion with the Church. This idea began to come into full power in the time of Tertullian, about A. D., 200. The things which they were so careful in some measure to conceal were precisely those which properly constitute the substantial matter entering into the idea of a Catechism, as the manner of administering baptism, confirmation, the ordination of priests, the manner of celebrating the holy Eucharist, the Liturgy, or divine service of the Church, and for some time also the mystery of the Trinity, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, till they were advanced so far as to be nearly ready for baptism. These points were of course spoken of to the catechumens, and their spiritual nature explained, but the mode of administration was withheld, and they were not permitted to be witnesses of them. The reasons for this concealment were said to be that the plainness and simplicity of them might not be contemned, that a greater reverence for them might be inspired, and that the candidates might be the more incited by a holy curiosity to go forward to know them.

It is easy to see, that while these peculiar sentiments prevailed no Catechisms for the people could be produced,

for this would have been to place in the hands of the people what was to be concealed from them.

CATECHISMS IN THE ROMAN CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES AND DOWN TO THE REFORMATION.

We have noticed the causes which hindered the introduction of Catechisms during the early ages of the Christian Church. When these views passed away and a public administration of these rites began to prevail, in the early Roman Church proper, another cause averse to Catechisms became active, namely the sentiment which laid less stress on the importance of Scripture knowledge and self-conscious apprehension of scriptural truth, on the part of the laity—the sentiment that the laity were to do rather than to know, and the instruction thought necessary was, therefore, rather that which pertained to ceremonies than that which belonged to the scriptural grounds of faith. The milk of the word was not thought so necessary to Christian growth as it was both earlier and later in the history of Christianity. The sacred word of truth lay concealed from the common people in an unknown tongue, nor was it thought necessary to bring out its fresh native life and power in simple Catechisms which might develop and enlighten the faith of the simple, that from a state of nonage they might grow to the full stature of self-conscious Christians.

It appears that during many centuries, though the people were taught to commit to memory the Lord's Prayer, Decalogue and Creed, these elements of a Catechism were not combined and explained in a Catechism till Christianity began to take firm hold of the occidental nations; and it seems further that among them we must seek for the origin of Catechisms approximating in any degree to the more modern idea. Among them were the fundamental elements which lie as the basis of Catechisms first rendered into the vulgar tongue, and enlarged by catechetical explanations.

The first German Catechisms originated in the eighth

and ninth centuries. Kero, a monk of St. Gall, probably in the year 720, furnished the first translation of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer into German, accompanying the latter with an explanation. This may be regarded as the seed of German Catechisms. Otfried, a monk of Weissenburg, who lived in the ninth century, is regarded as the author of the so-called Weissenburg Catechism, which was received with very unequal favor. The contents of this Catechism consist of the following points: The Lord's Prayer with an explanation of it. 2. The Peccata criminalia, or principal sins, among which are enumerated lust of the flesh, impurity, fornication, gluttony, idolatry, administering poison, enmity, strife, jealousy, wrath, contention, dissention, sect, envy, selfishness, murder, depression of spirits, drunkenness, adultery, and theft. 3. The Creed of Athenasius. 4. The Gloria in excelsis Deo.* Augusti quotes from this Catechism the explanation of the Lord's Prayer, and remarks: "It is at once seen that our Catechisms"—the Heidelberg and that of Luther—"have closely followed this, and that especially in Luther's Smaller Catechism, its simplicity and rich brevity are also reproduced." From a comparison of this part of that ancient work with the corresponding part of the Heidelberg Catechism, we find sufficient similarity to warrant the supposition that its authors had this Catechism at hand.

Amid the general darkness of the tenth and eleventh centuries, we find nothing approaching to a catechetical work, except a paraphrase of the Psalter and an explanation of the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed; though we are not informed that this was intended for the common people. In the Scholastic period from the twelfth to the fifteenth century the catechetical works which appeared were intended for the clergy rather than for the laity.

A small anonymous Roman Catholic Catechism was published at Heidelberg, 1494, bearing the title: Pater noster, Ave Maria and the Creed, according to the true

* Augusti-Versuch einer historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die beyden Haupt-Katechismen der Evangelischen Kirche. Elberfeld, 1824. p. 33.

text. Besides the matter mentioned in the title, it also treats of various kinds of sins, of the Ten Commandments and eight Beatitudes, of the Seven Sacraments, of absolution and some other matters drawn from ecclesiastical history. Another appeared at Cologne, 1509.

Farther than this we have no notice of Catechisms in the Roman Church. During these ages the prophetic office of Christ evidently failed to be fully represented in His Church in the instruction of the laity and their children. It was this, as we have noticed in our article on catechetical instruction, which more than anything else created that earnest sense of want in the bosom of the people, which prepared the way for the Reformation.

CATECHISMS IN THE ROMAN CHURCH SINCE THE REFORMATION.

We have seen how meagre in Catechisms the Roman Church was previous to the dawn of the Reformation. This great religious movement, which manifested so early and powerfully its zeal for the instruction of the youth and the ignorant common people by means of Catechisms and catechetical instruction, was a direct means of waking up the Roman Church to activity in the same direction. So evident is this fact, that crowned heads, persons in high ecclesiastical stations, and prominent writers in that Church, have openly acknowledged it. When the Emperor Ferdinand and Philip King of Spain by solemn letters or Edicts* approve the Catechism of Canisi, published in 1554, and commend it to the diligent and constant use of their subjects, they refer in an extensive way to the fact, that they found it proper and necessary to oppose a Catechism to the many Catechisms of the errorists which were leading so many persons astray. The same acknowledgment is made by that large body of Roman Catholic Theologians which constituted the celebrated Council of Trent, 1545–1564. The reason for preparing the Catechism which was occasioned by that body, is in its own pages said to be, that

* See these Edicts in the original Latin quoted in the Appendix to Koecher's Cat. Gesch. der Paebstlichen Kirche. Jenna 1753. pp. 275–284.

"those who proposed to themselves to corrupt the minds of the faithful, aware that it was impossible that they could hold immediate personal intercourse with all, and pour into their ears their poisoned doctrines, by adopting a different plan with the same intent, disseminated error and impiety much more easily and extensively. For besides those voluminous works, by which they sought to overthrow the Catholic faith, they also composed innumerable smaller treatises, which, carrying a semblance of piety on their surface, deceived the simple and the incautious with incredible facility.*" The same confession is made by the Papal Nuncio, Visconti in a letter from the Council of Trent to Boromeo, and also by the Jesuit Antonius Possevinus soon after the beginning of the Reformation.†

The influence in this respect exerted upon the Roman Catholic Church by the Reformation, is also strikingly evidenced by the great number of Catechisms which appeared. We have seen how few that Church possessed before; but we find in Koecher's Catechetical History of the Papal Church an account of at least twenty nine different Catechisms which were prepared and published in Latin and also some in German, between 1530 and 1566, when the Catechism of the Council of Trent made its appearance. This is at the rate of almost one each year. Among these was the celebrated one of Canisi, which, composed, 1554, was translated into different languages and very many editions published in the course of a few years. The favor, with which these catechetical works were received, shows what zeal had been awakened in favor of this important interest.

By far the most important Catechism of the Roman Catholic Church is that of the Council of Trent. Notwithstanding the numerous Catechisms then existing, there was a desire for one that should be *the* Catechism for the whole

---

* See Catechism of the Council of Trent. London, 1852. Question IV. Concerning the use made of the Catechism by heretics.

† For the passages at length see Koecher's Cat Gesch. der Päbstl. Kirch. pp. 10, 13, 14.

Church. The assembly which met at Trent, 1545, was naturally looked to for such a work; and a direct request to that effect was made by the Emperor Ferdinand, and Charles IX. King of France, through their representatives in that body. The Council took up the proposal with favor, and it is said, by an anonymous writer, that it was employed on this work from the eighteenth session, Feb. 26th, 1562, till the last session held in December, 1563. It was not finished by the Council; but, on motion of the Papal Legates, it was left in the hands of the Pope to be completed and published. True this measure met with strong opposition in the Council. The Bishop of Lorida made a long speech against it, contending that if any work belonged specially to the Council, it was the preparation of a Catechism, which next to the Symbol must occupy the first place in the Church; but as the most of the Fathers longed anxiously for the close of the Council, the proposition of the presiding Cardinals was at length accepted and the completion of the Catechism committed to the care of the Pope. The Council adjourned in December, 1563. About the same time the Heidelberg Catechism was finished,—while the Catechism itself only appeared in September, 1566.

To aid in its preparation, Pious V. called to Rome Leonard Marimus, Archbishop of Lausanne, Aegidius Fuscararius, Bishop of Modena, and Franciscus Forcrus, a Portuguese theologian, all of whom had been present at the Council of Trent. To these the Pope added three Cardinals, Boromeo, Sirletus and Antonianus, partly to oversee the catechetical labors of the other three learned men, and partly after the work was completed to review and prove it. To secure a good style the best Linguists of Rome were employed to give to the language its proper grace and finish. Thus finished it appeared at Rome both in the Italian and Latin languages. Many editions were successively published, and it was also translated into Polish, French and German. Abridgments were also prepared and published.

After an introduction, this Catechism consists of three

Parts, or Books. The introduction treats of the necessity, authority and office of pastors; of the heresies which had arisen in the last times, which had moved the Council to prepare this Catechism; and of the manner in which the Catechism should be used. In the first Part the articles of the Apostles' Creed are explained in thirteen chapters. The second Part, in eight chapters, treats of the doctrine of the Sacraments in general, and of the Seven Sacraments of the Roman Church in particular. The third Part, in ten chapters, treats of the Law and Commandments of God in general, after which the Ten Commandments are explained in their order. The fourth Part, in seventeen chapters, treats of Prayer, of its necessity and use, of the parts and degrees of prayer, of the things for which prayer ought to be made, of persons for whom prayer ought to be made, to whom prayer ought to be directed, of preparation for prayer, and of the manner of praying; then of the Lord's Prayer, and its seven petitions, which are explained in their order.

This Catechism is very extensive; the English translation before us covering 591 closely printed octavo pages. Not only its size, but also its erudite character makes it wholly unfit as a book for the instruction of children; and indeed it seems never to have been intended for that purpose. It is only necessary attentively to read a few pages of it to see that it is rather adapted as a directory to ministers or catechists, showing how they shall wisely conduct catechetical instruction, than suited as a book from which the ignorant and children may learn the truths of religion.

After this Catechism of Trent the Roman Church continued very fruitful in the production of Catechisms. Koecher, who professes not to have exhausted the subject by far, in his Catechetical History of the Papal Church down to 1753, gives an account more or less full of one hundred and twenty three post-Tridentine Catechisms. Many of these were prepared by missionaries for the instruction of the heathen. Others were local and limited in their circulation. Only three, that of Trent, that of

Casini, already mentioned, and one by Cardinal Belarmini, published in 1603, came into anything like general use. Since 1753 many others have been produced, as no single one seems to have had a general authority ; but rather, as Bungener in his History of the Council of Trent, remarks: "There may be a distinct one in each diocese, if the bishop choose."

CATECHISMS AMONG THE WALDENSES.

Catechisms and catechetical instruction were early introduced among the Waldenses, a sect of religionists who originated in the valleys of Piedmont, about the beginning of the twelfth century. Some of their early Catechisms have been printed, while others are only to be found here and there preserved in manuscript. The first Catechism among these people is said to have been formed A. D., 1100, It has been preserved in the historical works of Paul Perrin and John Leger.* It treats, says Koecher, of the three ruling virtues which are indispensably necessary to salvation, faith, love and hope; in connection with which are treated in a brief and rather unmethodical manner, the doctrines of faith in general, the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, of Christ himself, the most holy Trinity, the worship of God, Prayer, the Church, the Ministry, the Sacraments, grace of God and the Communion of Saints. Various errors of the Roman Church are also controverted.

Another Catechism of these people has been introduced to the learned world by Boxhorn in his History of the Netherlands. It is very brief, consisting of only fifteen questions which present their views of justification by Faith, of good works and their relation to the work of salvation, of the Sacraments, of the New Testament, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and of several false doctrines of the Papacy. Besides these the Waldenses have yet other Cat-

* Its title runs thus: Le Catechisme on Formulaire d'instruire les Enfans duquel out usç les Vaudoises et Albigeois, en maniere de Dialoque, on le Pasteur interlogue et l'Enfant respond, en leur langue propre. See Koecher's Cat. Gesh. der Waldenser, et cet. p. 2.

echisms in which single portions of catechetical matter are explained; such as: A twofold explanation of the Lord's Prayer; A brief explanation of the Apostles' Creed; An explanation of the Ten Commandments.* Still other works of this kind are mentioned by Perrin and others, which have not been printed, and are consequently not known beyond the titles by which reference to them has been made.

CATECHISMS AMONG THE BOHEMIAN BRETHREN.

The Bohemian Brethren who sprung up in Bohemia, A. D., 1467, and in early times stood in a certain spiritual communion with the Waldenses, cultivating their friendship, also imitated their industry and zeal in the work of catechetical instruction. The first Catechism of which we have any reliable information, appeared, A. D., 1523, in the Bohemian and German languages. This Catechism having been sent to Luther for his examination, he found objections to some of its teachings, especially in regard to the presence of Christ in the Eucharist and its explanation of faith, and made it the occasion of a little book. However he failed to effect the change in their views which he desired; and nine years later, A. D., 1532, the Brethren republished it strictly according to the original, carefully restoring such parts as by various persons had been changed. This Catechism consists of seventy three questions and answers, in which, after the manner of the Waldensian Catechism, they treat in general of the three cardinal virtues, faith, love, and hope. They begin with the doctrine of faith in which the Apostles' Creed is made the basis. Then follows the Ten Commandments, with which are mixed, without much order, many questions concerning love, faith in Christ, the eight Beatitudes, eternal life, the holy Trinity; also of the worship of God, and of creatures, especially of Mary and other saints, of the worship of Christ in the Eucharist, and of this sacrament itself, and concerning the fancied spirituality of monkery. Finally,

* Koecher's Cat. Gesh. der Waldenser, etc. p. 4, 5.

they treat of false and true hope, of evil passions, and of the unity of believers. Ehwalt supposes that Lucas Pragensis is the author of this Catechism; but that it was translated and published in German by John Horn; and that Pragensis, as a favor to Luther, to whom it was sent for examination, also translated it into Latin. He also says that the Ten Commandments are divided and presented in the same order which afterwards prevailed in the Lutheran Church.

John Gyrck translated a Catechism of the Bohemian Brethren into German, which he published in 1554 and again in 1555, dedicating it to Duke Albrecht of Prussia, into whose province many Brethren from Bohemia, driven by persecution, had fled, and for whose use it was intended. The Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's Prayer constitute the basis of this Catechism, which are extensively explained in questions and answers. These principal parts are introduced by questions relating to the character and the necessary knowledge of a Christian, and followed by some general teachings from the New Testament, "from which every one according to his state and calling may learn and know whether he stands assured of his salvation, and whether he may remain firmly and follow on in the way of piety and godly truth."*

This Catechism was again published in Königsburg, A. D., 1560, with an addition or Second Part, in which the doctrine of Holy Baptism, Absolution, Remission of Sin, the Lord's Supper and Eternal Life are treated. He professes to draw the doctrines presented on these points from the "general and true teachings of the Bohemian Brethren." He seems to have been moved to make this addition by the consideration that these points had not been adequately brought out in the existing Catechisms of the Brethren.

There was also a Catechism published for the use of the United Brethren in Bohemia and Moravia at Bremen, A.

---

* Koecher's Cat. Gesh. der Waldenser, etc. p. 16.

D., 1613 and also 1615.* It consists of only thirty questions, and is printed in four languages side by side in four columns on the same page—Greek, Latin, Bohemian, and German. It is made up of four parts. The first contains the Ten Commandments, which are divided after the order observed in the Reformed Church, and explained in eight questions; the second is formed by the Apostles' Creed, which is accompained with three questions on the nature and the means of faith and salvation; the third contains the Lord's Prayer with three explanatory questions; the fourth treats of the Service of Christ, namely the Word of God, the Keys, and the Sacraments.

John Gottlieb Elsner mentions a very brief Catechism of the Bohemian Brethren published in Polish and German. It treats in six Parts, of the Ten commandments, the confession of the Christian faith, the Lord's Prayer, Baptism, he Lord's Supper, and the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; at the end it contains an extended exposition of the words of Institution of our Lord's Supper for the instruction of well-grown youth. As no date or edition is mentioned, Koecher thinks this may be the same Catechism as that which Elsner published in the German Language, under the title: The Small Bohemian Catechism, with a new analysis for the benefit of school children. Berlin, 1748."† Koecher also mentions a Larger Catechism, consisting of 203 questions, which was translated from Bohemian into Latin, A. D., 1616, and which, with a smaller one in Polish and German, was in use at the time he wrote, 1768, in the Polish churches of the Brethren. This one is said to follow the previous Catechisms of the Brethren as to form and doctrine.

These Catechisms all enjoyed general favor among the Brethren; and besides these, there are others mentioned by Koecher which became less popular, and also several cat-

---

* Summa Catechismi, in usum Scholarum orthodoxarum Unitatis fratrum in Bohemia et Moravia, graece, latine, bohemice et Germanice, Bremae 1615.

† Koecher's Cat. Gesch. der Waldenser, etc., p. 22.

echetical works in questions and answers intended for the general instruction and edification of adult Christians.

CATECHISMS AMONG THE MORAVIANS.

The Moravians, or United Brethren, trace their connection historically, doctrinally, and ecclesiastically to the Bohemian Brethren. In 1612 a civil war broke out in Bohemia, which was followed by a violent religious persecution, so that in 1621 it caused the entire dispersion of their ministers, and brought great distress on the Brethren. They were scattered into different lands. In 1727, a number, principally from Moravia, founded a colony, on an estate of Count Zinzendorf and under his patronage in Upper Lustria, which they called Herrnhut. Having considerably increased by the immigration of the scattered Brethren from various parts, they were finally fully organized under "a system of social compact and church discipline resembling that of the ancient church of the Moravian Brethren," in 1727; "and thus formed the first stock of the present Society of United Brethren," or Moravians.

Count Zinzendorf is regarded as the founder of this Society of Christians, "to which he devoted his whole life, property, and energy." They have always strenuously objected to being regarded as a separate denomination, "and consequently admit of no peculiar articles of faith." When required by governments to point out their creed, they have always professed general adherence to the Augsburg Confession, as best representing their views. Yet they have also produced and used Catechisms.

Their first Catechism was prepared by Count Zinzendorf himself soon after their organization in Herrnhut. It is called; "Milk of the doctrine of Jesus Christ," and was published in 1723. This little work has been severely censured as being rather childish than childlike.‡ It was regarded as a failure, and went speedily out of use. This prepared the way for another, and a larger one from the same hand, constructed on the basis of Luther's Smaller

‡ Koecher Cat. Gesch. der Waldenser, etc., p. 296, 297.

Catechism, which fact is mentioned on the title-page. It was first published in 1725. In 1735 he published a revised and improved edition. This Catechism was regarded with great favor among the Brethren; and Zinzendorf himself mentions that it was more than once honored in Dresden, the capital of Saxony, by being used in catechetical examinations.

We have also a Catechism or "book of instruction for the so-called Brethren society" published at Altona, 1740; of which also a revised edition appeared at Budingen and Leipsic, 1742, the authorship of which is by some ascribed to David Nitchman and by others to Count Zinzendorf. This work appears to be rather a book for the general instruction of the members, than a Catechism for the elementary instruction of children. In the preface the author says, that it is not the design of this work either to undervalue or set aside the use of Luther's small Catechism; from which we learn that this catechetical work of Luther was at that time in use among them.

CATECHISMS IN THE GREEK OR RUSSIAN CHURCH.

It has not been till a comparatively late period that the Greek and Russian church has produced a Catechism. The first one was from the pen of Peter Mogilas, metropolitan of Kiow. It was prepared, A. D., 1642. In March, A. D., 1643, it was examined and approved by Parthenius, patriarch at Constantinople, in connection with his subordinate clergy and priesthood. It is not certainly known in what language it was originally prepared—no doubt in both the Sclavonian or Russian, and the Greek. The learned world is indebted for its first knowledge of this work to Paganiota, the Roman royal interpreter, who published it in Latin and Greek in Amsterdam, Holland, A. D., 1662. This edition was taken to Constantinople by Paganiota and distributed gratitously among the Greek Christians. He published another edition, A. D., 1672. Another edition in modern Greek was published in Bucorest, in Moldon, A. D., 1699. Other editions are also known, in which the date and place

of publication are not given. Still the book was scarce in most of European countries till Laurentius Normann, Professor at Upsal, and afterwards Bishop at Gothenburg, published a Latin edition at Leipsic, A. D., 1695. It was translated into Dutch by John Anthony Seiner, and published at Harlem, A. D., 1722; also into German, by John Leonhard Frisch, and published at Frankfurt and Leipsic, A. D., 1727.

This Catechism consists of three Parts according to the three cardinal Christian virtues, faith, hope, and love, resembling in this respect those of the Waldenses and Bohemian Brethren. The first Part, in regard to faith, in one hundred and twenty-six questions, explains the Creed of the Council of Nice and that also of the Council of Constantinople, and treats incidentally of the seven Sacraments. The second, in reference to hope, in sixty-three questions, contemplates the Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes. The third, concerning love toward God and our neighbor, in seventy two questions, treats of the Christian virtues, of the sins of lust, and explains finally the Ten Commandments. The proofs are taken from the holy Scriptures and the declarations of the councils and church fathers.

Though this Catechism was originally prepared for the instruction and benefit of the Russians, it was soon also well received among the Greeks; and such was the favor extended to it, that the whole Greek Church, has approved and received it as a general confession of faith.*

Besides this Larger Catechism the Greek Church has also several smaller catechisms. The first one was published as early as 1677, including also an A. B. C. Book; and another of similar form and contents in 1721 or 1722. A number of other Catechisms of a more private character, and more limited use, are mentioned by Koecher. This author adds at the same time, that zeal in catechetical instruction in the Greek Church was by no means what the

* Koecher's Cat. Gesch. der Waldenser, etc., p. 62.

number of their Catechisms would lead us to suppose; and, that it had so degenerated in the last century as to be far less attended to than it was in the century preceding. It vanished before an increasing tendency toward ceremonials.

THE EARLIEST CATECHISMS OF THE LUTHERANS.

Though a full catechetical history of the Lutheran Church cannot here be given, it seems proper to take some notice of the origin of Catechisms among this denomination of Christians, and especially of those prepared by Luther himself.

We have spoken of the Catechisms, which originated in that period of expectation and desire, which may be regarded as the dawn of the Reformation. From the Lutherans, however, proceeded the first Catechism after the Reformation had properly commenced; and Westphalia has the honor of being the land of its birth.

The Reformation in that country began among the order of Augustinian monks and the Society of the Brothers and Sisters of the Common Life, among whom its seeds had been sown more immediately by merchants returning from Upper and Lower Saxony, who had there imbibed of its spirit. Here also the call of Luther to the German people in 1520 originated the Lutheran movement. As early as 1521, the Augustinian monks of the town of Lippe, now in Prussia, having great respect for Luther, sent two learned brethren of their order, John Westerman and Hermann Roiten, to Wittenberg, there to study theology. After three years, 1524, these returned as true disciples of Luther and Melanchthon, and the first as Prior, and the second as Lector in the Convent, began to spread the doctrines of the Reformation in Lippe, as also later in Münster and Detmold. Such was the desire awakened by his preaching in the town of Lippe, and in the sorrounding villages from which the people flocked to hear, that Westerman was induced to prepare a Catechism "containing the principal doctrines of the pure Christianity," for the instruction of the people. That it might be the better un-

derstood by the simple-minded people for whom it was designed, he wrote it in the Westphalian dialect. It was published in 1525, four years previous to the appearance of the small Catechism of Luther.* This Catechism was eagerly read and did much for the spread and firmer establishment of the evangelical doctrines.

In 1527, Caspar Aquila, a scholar and friend of Luther, who was pastor and superintendent at Saalfeld, prepared a German Catechism for children, which he used in his congregation. It is not certain, however, whether it was at that time printed. Certain it is, that it only became generally known after its author in 1547 published an improved edition.

"It appears also," says Augusti, "that the German Catechism of John Brentz, commonly called the Catechism of Halle, which was highly commended by Luther and which in many parts of Southern Germany had symbolical authority, was written between 1521 and 1527. This one has six principal parts, and is composed in questions and answers. The Latin Catechism of John Brentz published, 1551, is much shorter and has also a different form."

As early as 1526, Luther wrote these remarkable words: "Well, in God's name! there is first of all needed in the German worship a rustic, plain, simple Catechism. This kind of instruction I know not how to arrange more simply and better than it has been from the beginning of Christendom and has hitherto remained, namely the three parts—the Ten Commandments, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer. In these three things, what is necessary for a Christian to know, stands before us plainly and briefly. Here let no one think himself too wise, and thus slight such child's play. When Christ wished to draw men to himself he had to become a man. Are we to bring up children, we must become children with them." In these words, we have well and truly indicated, not only the importance of Catechisms,

* See van Alpen's Gesch. u. Litteratur des Heid. Catech. Frankfort 1800, pp. 206–211. Also, Goebel's Gesch. des Christl. Lebens in der rheinisch-westph. evangl. Kirche. Coblenz. 1849. Erster Band pp. 129, 130.

but also what matter should enter into their composition, and in what manner and spirit it ought to be presented before children. Still three years more passed before Luther made the effort to realize his idea of a Catechism. It seems that he feared making the attempt; "Yea," says Augusti, "it even appears as if he had even intended to leave the matter of preparing a Catechism to some of his friends." Some say he proposed this work to Justus Jonas and John Agricola, which seems somewhat improbable, though there is mention made of a little Catechism by John Agricola, bearing the title: "A Christian exercise in God's word and doctrine, 1526."

By direction of John, the Constant, Elector of Saxony, a general visitation of the churches and schools of that electorate took place. This revealed to Luther the great need of the better instruction of the common people and their children in matters of religion, and became the more immediate occasion, as he himself informs us in the Preface to his smaller Catechism, which led him to the preparation of his two Catechisms, both of which appeared in the memorable year 1529, in which the name Protestant was first given to the friends of the Reformation. It is not certain which of these two Catechisms, the smaller or larger, was prepared first. In the Preface to the smaller one, the existence of the other is presupposed; and it is therefore probable that the larger one was then already prepared. Sure it is, that both were published in the same year.

The Catechisms of Luther consisted originally of five principal Parts: 1. The Ten Commandments. 2. Faith. 3. The Lord's Prayer. 4. The Sacrament of holy Baptism. 5. The Sacrament of the Altar. Between the fourth and fifth, the Part pertaining to Absolution or the Office of the Keys, was later introduced, which then constituted the 5th part, while the Lord's Supper formed the sixth. When, and by whom, the part pertaining to absolution was introduced are matters in dispute among Lutheran theologians. It is agreed that it was done between thirty and forty years after the Catechism was formed. It was not included in the official publication of the Form of

Concord, 1576, which is proof that it was not regarded a part of the Catechism.

The second edition of the Larger Catechism, which appeared in the same year with the first, 1529, was enlarged by "a new instruction and exhortation to confession."

These Catechisms became exceedingly popular in the Lutheran Church; and though many others have been since published, yet no one has ever succeeded in superseding these. They became at once *the* Catechisms of that denomination and continue so to this day.

CATECHISMS AMONG THE SOCINIANS.

The Socinians at an early period of their history had recourse to Catechisms for the spread of their peculiar tenets. Though not the first, yet the most important of their Catechisms was called the Catechism of Rackau, a town in Poland where it was first published in the Polish language, 1605, a year after the death of Socinius. It was also called the Larger Catechism, in distinction from a Smaller one, which was drawn forth from it soon after it appeared, and which was published in Polish, German and Latin, and circulated among the people. It was also translated into German by Valentine Schmalcius, pastor at Rackau, and published with a preface or dedication to the University of Wittenberg, 1608. The reason he gives for this dedication is, that it is not merely our duty to present the holy truth to the simple, but also to lay it open before the eyes of the most wise and learned; and as the truth had gone out from Wittenberg through the excellent man, Luther, it was meet that it should also now in greater perfection return thither!! One year later, 1609, this Catechism also appeared in Latin; and still later in Dutch, both changed and improved according to the theological fancies of the translators. The translator, Moscorovius, had the presumption to send a copy to James I of England, submitting it to his examination and judgment. It was coldly, or perhaps we might say, *warmly* received by the British king, inasmuch as it was publicly burnt by order of Par-

liament. This Catechism was so frequently enlarged, abridged, and changed, not only in its language but in its doctrines, that the trumpet always gave forth a new, and consequently a very uncertain sound. Scarcely was it believed or refuted in one form, when it appeared in another —how like the history of error!

This Catechism contains nine chapters, with numerous subdivisions. Nothing of the usual catechetical matter is contained in it except the Ten Commandments and the sacraments, and these last in some translations are omitted. "A close examination will show," says Koecher, "that it contains of nothing less than catechetical divinity. A large portion of the doctrines therein contained are beyond the capacity and comprehension of the common people; and the mode and manner of presentation is rather polemical than catechetical. In one word, the book is not so much a Catechism as a pamphlet of theological controversy." Many works appeared in refutation of this Catechism.

Though other Catechisms afterwards appeared, they had more of an individual character, and their use and authority was confined to narrow circles, while those mentioned remained the most important and most generally received exponents of the Socinan tenets. Little is said in the history of this sect of their catechetical practices. Though catechetical instruction was no doubt practiced, as the number of their Catechisms would indicate, yet it never seems to have attained a very prominent place in their religious operations. The principal reason of this, no doubt, is, that the theological subtleties and negative polemical character of their faith was not adapted to the feelings and capacities of the young. The "spirit that always denies," is in its nature averse to the true and proper life and meaning of catechization. To Catechisms, as to children, belongs a positive faith. Babes want milk, not a chemical analysis of milk.

CATECHISMS AMONG THE MENNONITES.

The Mennonites, also called Anabaptists, receive their name from Menno Simon, once a notoriously profligate Romish priest, and native of Friesland, who embraced the tenets of the Anabaptists, and they date their rise in the united Provinces of the Netherlands, A. D., 1536. During the first hundred years of their existence, they manifested little catechetical activity. The first Catechism produced by these people was published at Harlem, A. D., 1633. Its substance, as indicated in the work itself, is principally drawn from the writings of Menno Simon, and Diedrich Philipps ; but the author of it is not now known. After a preface to the reader, there follows another on the discipline and instruction of children. The Catechism itself is in the form of a conversation between a father and son, the son asking and the father answering. It is divided into two parts. The first teaches how wisdom is to be prayed for and attained, with an explanation of the articles of faith according to the Apostles' Creed. The second treats of the Bride or Church of Christ and proper views concerning her ; of Christian Baptism ; of the warfare of the baptized against their own foes and those of Christ ; of the Ban ; of the Lord's Supper ; of washing of Saints' feet ; of the government ; of Marriage ; of the Resurrection of the Dead ; of the Ten Commandments ; of Love and Peace. To this is added a direction to prayer, including a brief explanation of the Lord's Prayer, and a collection of forms of prayer.

Koecher gives also the titles, contents, and date of publication of the following Catechisms; which were issued in Holland and in the Dutch language by the Mennonites: 1. A Catechism by Reinier Wybrantz, Amsterdam, 1640. 2. One by Tielman von Bracht, 1657. Up to 1699 ten editions of this catechism were published. It was translated into German by Jacob Kliever, 1743. 3. One by Samuel Apostle and Samuel Van Deil, first published at Amsterdam, 1677, and again in 1686 and 1743. 4. That of Galen Abraham, prepared and first published at Amster-

dam, 1677—again in 1693, and afterwards often. An abridgment of this Catechism was also published, Amsterdam, 1682. This Catechism gave great offence to the Mennonites on account of the erroneous views taught therein; among other errors, denying the true Divinity of Christ, and making the Holy Spirit a mere divine energy, or influence. The result was a separate sect called Galeneans. 5. One by Hadrian Van Eeghem, Middleburg, 1687. This Catechism is said to express erroneous views in regard to the Trinity and the person of Christ. 6. A Catechism by Van Dooregeest, Amsterdam, 1692. This is said to be rather a theological compendium than a Catechism. 7. The Flandrian and Waterlandian congregations, from different provinces of Holland, which were wont to hold assemblies in Amsterdam, were anxious for many years to form a suitable catechetical book to be used among them. After their purpose had, from various causes, for a long time been hindered, the preparation of such a work was at length entrusted to John Martin Mol and Michael Fortgen. Fortgen died before the work was complete; Mol lived to finish it, but was soon after called away by death. The review and correction of it was then committed to Van Dooregeest, Herman Schyn, and Peter Beets, from whose hands it received its finish, when it was published in Amsterdam, July, 1697. This book became quite popular. The fourth edition appeared in 1728; and between that date and 1740 five more editions were published. In the preface to the edition of 1740, the catechetical customs of the first Christians are greatly praised and held up as an example for imitation. It also includes a shorter Catechism for beginners. 8. Frederick and Cornelius Van Huyzen, two Mennonite teachers at Emden, published a Catechism, 1698. Jacob Kat prepared a Catechism for his congregation in Amsterdam. The second edition bears date 1736. 9. Abraham Verduin, moved by the great ignorance prevailing among his fellow believers, prepared a Catechism, and published it at Harlem, 1734. He published also two other Catechisms; one 1707, the other 1714. 10.

Peter Boudewyn prepared and published a Catechism for the use of the Flandrian Mennonites, Harlem, 1743. 11. With a view of correcting some erroneous tendencies which he believed to exist among many of his Flandrian brethren, Henry Waerma published a Catechism at Emden, 1744. Several others of less importance are mentioned by Koecher as having appeared in Holland.

Besides these Catechisms which appeared in Holland, there are also several which originated with the Mennonites of Prussia. These appeared as follows: 1. A short Catechism in 1690, and also other editions later. 2. A larger Catechism, having for its basis the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, prepared by D. John Peter Sprunck, appeared in 1738.

The Mennonites in England, who took the name of Baptists, also early began to use Catechisms. The first adopted the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly, leaving out, however, the questions that pertain to the subjects of Baptism. They have also a Catechism, which was used principally at their charity school at Horselydoun, Southwark, prepared by Benjamin Stinton; the date of its publication is not mentioned.

Very considerable zeal in catechization animated the Mennonite persuasion in earlier times, and in other lands —especially in Holland. In our own country Catechisms and catechizing have passed almost entirely out of view among them. Their ministers take no salary, thinking that the laborer is not worthy of his hire; as nothing is paid them for instructing the young, the young have no claim on their attention. Having thus to support themselves, they devote their attention generally to farming. Being good farmers they get wealthy, and their children, without any catechetical instruction, follow their example.

CATECHISMS AMONG THE ARMINIANS.

Though the Arminians or Remonstrants of Holland were no particular friends of confessions of faith, and their system gathered mainly round protested points which made

it necessarily unfriendly to the production of Catechisms; and though they spoke severely of the Reformed for requiring their children to repeat the Catechism in the Church,* yet they found it necessary also to call in their aid. The first Catechism prepared and published under the auspices of the entire body is one, the authorship of which is ascribed to John Uytenbogard, an Arminian preacher at the Hague. It first appeared at Goude, 1640. A second edition, enlarged and improved, was published in Rotterdam the same year. Successive editions were published in the same city, 1664, 1697, 1701, 1718, 1726, 1752.

The same year in which the Catechism first named appeared, Bartholomew Praevost, a very learned minister among the Arminians, regarding this book not sufficiently simple for children, prepared one smaller and simpler, following the order of the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Supper, which was published 1640. This Catechism found great favor, and was often republished. It was afterwards still farther simplified in some of its parts by a division of some questions, and in this form published, Amsterdam, 1675, 1705, 1718, 1733, 1751. It was divided into fifty-two Lessons, no doubt with a view to its use on every Sunday in the year.

Two other Arminian Catechisms are mentioned by Koecher. One by John Molinae was published at Gravenhage, 1683; and afterwards, enlarged by one half, at Rotterdam successively, 1694, 1699, and 1718. An abridgment of it was also published in the same city, 1696, 1725. The other by Everhard Poppium, appeared at Utrecht, 1661.

CATECHISMS AMONG THE FRIENDS OR QUAKERS.

Of all religious systems it might be supposed that the one adhered to by the Friends or Quakers, would be least adapted to the production and use of Catechisms. Yet even they have been constrained to call them into service.

* Koecher's Cat. Gesch. der Waldenser, etc. p. 224.

The first Catechism among the Friends was published in the Latin language in London, 1660. It is entitled: "Catechismus pro parvulis"—a Catechism for boys, and in place of the author's name are simply the initials, G. F., which no doubt stand for George Fox, the originator of this sect; which supposition is also sustained by other reliable evidence. This Catechism is in the form of a conversation between a father and son, in which the son asks and the father answers. It is said to lack greatly in order and arrangement; and is not so much a Catechism as a severe censure and abuse of the then existing Churches and institutions of learning, putting his own individual notions in the place of divine teachings.

Another Catechism of this sect was published in English by Robert Barclay at Urie, in Scotland, 1673. A third edition is also mentioned by Koecher as having appeared in London, 1690. The same work appeared in a Dutch translation in Amsterdam, Holland, 1675, 1721; also in Latin at Rotterdam, 1676; and finally in German at Amsterdam, 1670.

In this Catechism Barclay has given all the answers in the words of Scripture. Hence he calls it on the title page: "A Catechism and Confession of Faith, approved of and agreed unto by the General Assembly of the Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles, Christ himself Chief Speaker in and among them." A moment's reflection, however, will convince a thoughtful person that a Catechism is not necessarily Scriptural even when all its answers are in the very words of the Scriptures; for every thing depends upon the sense and application, which passages of Scripture are made to have in the mind of the one who makes use of them. (2 Peter 3: 16.) Barclay's Catechism seems to be as much intended for adults as for children. "It is fitted," he tells us in the preface, "as well for the wisest and largest, as for the weakest and lowest capacities." We have heard of no modern Catechisms among the Friends.

CATECHISMS AMONG SEPARATISTS.

There are many Catechisms extant, which have appeared in various countries and at different times, and which have proceeded from separatistic and fanatically disposed persons, who did not acknowledge themselves as belonging to any Christian communion. Our present purpose does not require us to give a detailed account of these works; should the reader desire this kind of information, he is referred to Koecher's Catechetical History of the Waldences, etc., where he will find a more or less full account of a large number of this class of Catechisms.

It is simply necessary here to refer to their ruling characteristics. They all profess to be in the strictest sense Biblical, many of them giving the answers to the questions in the exact words of Scripture, casting aside all that are written "in human language" as the "vain work of men;" just as if, stringing together passages of Scripture on the frame-work of an individual theory, and applying them to confirm the private notion of the compiler, and thus often wresting them from their true sense, were not the work of man, yea, the very worst work of self-delusion a man can be at. (2 Peter 3: 16.) Thus we have one from Bernhard Peter Karl, Bremen, 1704, "in which simple questions are all answered in the clear and simple words of the holy Scriptures;" and he therefore modestly claims that his Catechism "has been approved by the General Assembly of the Apostles and Evangelists, yea, by Christ himself, who also spoke in them by the Spirit." As one evidence of the scriptural character of this perfectly scriptural Catechism, we need only notice that "the doctrine of the Sacraments and all connected with them is omitted as not really belonging to the inner substance of Christianity." This reminds one of the proposal to perform the play of Hamlet with Hamlet's part left out! which Shakespeare would hardly acknowledge as his play. We have a similar "Scripture Catechism for children" from John Biddle, London, 1654, "wherein the chiefest points of the Christian religion being question-wise proposed, resolve them-

selves by pertinent answers taken word for word out of the Scriptures, without either consequences or comment. Composed for their sakes that would fain be mere Christians, and not of this or that sect, in as much as all sects of Christians, by what names soever distinguished, have either more or less departed from the simplicity or truth of the Scriptures." He informs us in the Preface that "he receives no other rule of faith but the Scriptures." Right; but by whom, and how shall it be interpreted? To this he cooly answers, "reason!" As a specimen of the way in which his own "reason" enlightened him, we have the fact, that he acknowledges only one person in the Godhead, and accords nearly all his teachings with the teachings of the Socinians.

This class of Catechisms, of course, all set themselves in opposition to all the existing Churches, are imbued with a zeal for the reformation of existing Christianity from its supposed errors, make little or no account of sacraments, and seek to promote separatistic and fanatical self-sufficiency, passing off this heated vapor for the true golden flame of the altar.

CATECHISMS AMONG THE METHODISTS.

The Methodists have lately found it necessary in a certain way to resort to Catechisms and catechetical instruction. Agreeably to an arrangement of the General Conference a series of Catechisms was proposed—three in number—two of them having been prepared, were laid before that body for examination and action in May, 1852. These works were referred to a committee. "After a careful examination, the committee reported in favor of the plan and execution of the Catechisms submitted; whereupon the Conference unanimously adopted the report of the committee, and ordered the immediate publication of No. 1 and 2, and the completion and issue of No. 3 on the plan proposed."

The character and design of these Catechisms may be learned from the Preface to No. 1. "The characteristics

of this Catechism are, brevity, comprehensiveness, and systematic arrangement. It is not published as a child's Catechism merely, but as the CATECHISM OF THE CHURCH, including both young and old. While the language is studiously adapted to the comprehension of children it is suitable to be retained in memory through life. Hence it is not proposed in other numbers of the series to change the language of the present. This is called Catechism No. 1, only for the sake of distinction. It is *the* Catechism. No. 2, is the same, with the addition of numerous Scripture proofs and illustrations printed side by side with the several questions and answers. No. 3 also repeats the Catechism in small type for reference, but is designed for a series of instruction of a much higher grade."

The plan pursued in the arrangement of the matter is prevailingly that of systematic divinity, and not the old catechetical order. They are rather dialogues on successive points of faith than Catechisms in the church sense. They are not creations, but compilations made on the eclectic plan. "Some of the questions relate to the theory, and some to the practice of religion; some of them are found in other Catechisms, and some are new. In its preparation, constant reference has been made to the elaborate catechetical works of former times with the intention of copying their excellences and improving upon their construction and phraseology." Only the Ten Commandments out of the old catechetical matter are introduced in the Catechism proper—the Lord's Prayer is given with an exposition in No. 3. The Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed are given in an Appendix—but in the creed the article, "He descended in Hell," is omitted, and that of the Church is explained in a note to mean "the Church of God in general!" Prayers are also added in the Appendix, concerning which it is said in the Preface, that "the importance of teaching the young some forms of prayer to aid and guide their devotions, is obvious."

True and important as the matter of these Catechisms generally is, there is throughout an absence of the true idea

of a Catechism. One is deeply convinced of the fact that making a Catechism is not the duty of any man, nor of every age; and that it is a work utterly impossible to be accomplished in a denomination in which there is wanting the educational idea of religion, according to which the baptized child is to grow up a Christian by the presence and the means of the proper nurture, from the grace of baptism. Had the authors of these Catechisms started from the principle underlying what is called the "Baptismal Covenant,"* as given in the Appendix of their work, and consistently followed it out, their Catechisms would not only have been entirely different from what they are, but infinitely better.

It seems not to be designed by these Catechisms to introduce pastoral catechization in the churches with a view to a direct preparation for full communion with the Church; rather "it is hoped that the study of this manual of Christian truth may become universal in our Sunday schools and in our families, and that the day will soon come when no person among us of sufficient age will be found ignorant of its contents or unable to give a reason of the hope that is in him." In another place it is said, that "continued perseverance is essential to success in catechetical instruction. It is therefore earnestly recommended to parents, teachers, and ministers to review their pupils in the Catechism with frequency and regularity."

There are prominent men in the Methodist Church—and the number is growing, who favor the use of Catechisms and

---

* "I renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the sinful desires of the flesh, so that I will not follow nor be led by them." Then follows the Apostles' Creed bating the mutilations already noticed; after that, it concludes thus: 'Having been baptized in this faith, I will obediently keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my life, God being my helper." This is taken from the Baptismal Office of the Episcopal Church, where it is consistently at home, resting in the old idea of baptismal grace; transferred into these Catechisms it is a stranger in a strange land and can never be made to know its neighbors and to harmonize with its new surroundings.

much is said and written which sounds all right, but it is clearly neither spoken nor understood in the *animus* of the old catechectical system. Our brethren have yet to learn the important difference between a Catechism and a dialogue—and also between educating *unto* grace, and educating *in* grace—and how faith is in order unto knowledge, and not knowledge unto faith. Without clearly seeing, and deeply feeling the radical significance of these differences, no one can either know what a Catechism is, much less know how to make one or use it.

The history of Catechisms in the Reformed Church is too extensive to be entered upon in this article. It is our intention to treat of it in a separate article hereafter.

H. H.

St. John's church, Lebanon, Pa.

Art. VIII.—HUMILITY, THE BASIS OF MORAL GREATNESS.

A DISCOURSE BY DR. RAUCH.

The parable of the Pharisee and Publican represents to us two moral characters that are diametrically opposed to each other. The one is that of selfishness and pride, the other that of humility and consciousness of guilt. The former is exhibited in the Pharisee, the latter in the Publican.

The Pharisee blesses God, because he fasts twice a week, pays the tenth of all he has; because he is not as the Publican, but rather better than he. He lays therefore claim, not to any particular virtue or worldly greatness, but relies upon *self-righteousness.*

The Publican, on the other hand, retired into the background, silent, his eyes cast down, seems to be lost in meditation and in the feeling of his unworthiness; all that he thinks and all that he says, are the few words: God be merciful to me, a sinner.

The words both of the Pharisee and the Publican, were uttered in a prayer. Prayer whether uttered or unexpressed, is the immediate conversation of the soul with God, in which every one acknowledges that God not only hears, but also knows us. Hence whatever any one says in prayer, may generally be considered—unless we take him to be a hypocrit—as evincing his whole being, as expressing fully his thoughts and feelings. Hence we are constrained to believe, that the Pharisee looked upon himself as a good man, who, according to his best conscience, was free from the crimes he enumerated, and on the other hand, that the Publican was a sinner, and that his humble words were not merely an empty phrase, but the expression of his humility. While now the Pharisee no doubt has more legal

righteousness to boast of than the Publican, Christ says nevertheless: "I tell you this man went down to his house justified rather than the other."

It is humility that contains all the elements requisite for true conversion according to the New Testament, and therefore it was easier for the Publican, than for the Pharisee, to reform. Hence Christ adds: "For every one that exalteth himself, shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself, shall be exalted."

This parable, like many other passages in the Bible, teaches us clearly: that as *pride* and haughtiness is the root of *all evil*, so *humility* is the basis of all *moral greatness*. I shall first prove, that this is so, and then show that it can not be otherwise.

It is natural, that in proportion as we become conscious of the many advantages we possess over all nature around us, we should love them and place a high value upon them, that we should aspire higher and desire to be acknowledged each one by the other. But selfish pride perverts this rational pleasure arising from the sense of these advantages, and induces us to overate them and ascribe a superiority to ourselves that we in no way possess. Even the best of us, the more he learns to know himself and all that is his, the less he can feel satisfied with himself; he will discover in every beauty some blemish, in every power some weakness, in every talent some dullness, and in every virtue some frailty; and especially will he lament and deplore his great distance from Christ. Selfish pride, however, renders us satisfied with ourselves; it knows of nothing that is reproachful in us, for it estimates itself too highly and others too low; it makes us appear better than any one else with whom we compare ourselves, for while it sharpens our sight to see the mote in the eye of our neighbor it blinds us to the beam in our own; of all decisions ours are the best; of all creeds, ours alone is the true one; of all works ours are most perfect; of all actions ours are most praiseworthy. If we are ever constrained to acknowledge a weakness, we understand well how to beautify and excuse

it, so that in comparison with the frailties of others ours will still retain the character of virtues. Thus wrapt up in a selfish love of all that belongs to us, we are surrounded by a magic circle whose centre we are ourselves, and whatever is beautiful or good par eminence is within it, while all that is without it is less lovely and attractive. Hence it is that we are satisfied with ourselves; while we discover numberless faults in others, *we* are good and perfect. And if so, how can we think it necessary to aspire to any thing high? to alter any thing in our character? If we feel no want, can we endeavor to remove it? If we have already what we desire, if our highest wishes are satisfied, would it not be folly to seek for any change?

If it be true now, that every one without exception is a sinner, that even the best of all that live, many as his virtues may be, and however strong his character and principles, is still weak and liable to fall; if even the best one resembles in this respect the Greek Achilles, who though invulnerable in every part of his body that had been touched by the waters of the Styx, was still vulnerable in that place by which his mother held him, then all of us share the same danger, and nothing can protect us from destruction except higher aid, and nothing can lead us sooner to it than self-confidence and a feeling of entire security.

Pride then stands in the way of moral greatness, but humility leads to it.

Humility is above all a feeling of this our weakness and danger, of our unworthiness and sinfulness, and of our entire dependence upon God for all that is good. Not satisfied with appearances, it teaches us to know ourselves as we are. Humility turns off our eyes from gazing on our external advantages, the beauty of our form, the talents we possess, and from the arts and knowledge which we have acquired in order to occupy a prominent rank in society; from the dress in which we appear, and the house in which we live. Humility looks upon the *heart* and its condition. If this be corrupt, if the fountain of our feelings and thoughts, and the soul of our actions be poisoned, all

that flows forth from it, all that is nourished by it, however beautifully and luxuriantly it may grow, must bear the germ of death within. Pride, it is true, may from selfish motives, induce us to seek for greatness by developing our talents for art, by acquiring facility in transacting business, by collecting knowledge, by doing many apparently good works which may secure us the admiration of the world; but it is only humility that points out to us true greatness, the greatness of the heart. Morally great is not the single and isolated deed, nor a series of deeds, but that which is the basis of deeds, their source and soul, the disposition and nobleness of the heart. Not the action is great, but the *will* that designs and executes it; not the gift we offer deserves praise, but the love that disposes us to bring it; not the pressing of the hand of an enemy, but the meekness and mildness that moves the hand, is great and praiseworthy. This purity and nobleness of heart alone is true greatness; it is such, whether actions represent it or not; it appears in no one action entirely, but even the best action gives only an imperfect and unsatisfactory evidence of it. We may succeed in exhibiting learning, strength, skill, art, or the agility of the body, but it is utterly impossible to exhibit this internal greatness; that is known only to God, and though it constantly produces noble works no work is equal to it. Hence it is constantly engaged, without ever affecting it, in bringing about a harmony between the idea of greatness and our life—a harmony between our public and domestic life.

We see, then, that the greatness of pride and that of humility differ entirely; the one consists in something external, in works, talents and the like, the other in something internal, in nobleness of disposition, purity of heart, in peace with God, in a desire to promote His glory and honor.

But there is another difference. Pride desires what is great on its own account, humility on account of the honor of God. While humility does not disdain what is lovely and beautiful, as talents, cultivation, learning, or skill and science, it rejoices in all of them, like the pilgrim rejoices

in the flowers that spring up on both sides of his path. As he bends down with intense delight to pluck them, not for the purpose of keeping them, but to weave them into a garland that he desires to see hanging around the picture he adores, so we must rejoice in what we have only because we intend by it to honor our Saviour.

Any man now that has such an idea of true greatness and compares himself as he is with the idea, that perceives the great distance of his life from this idea and the impurity of his heart—he cannot help feeling sorrow, and a solicitude to reform, to make a beginning in the indispensable change of his life. Thus we see that humility alone renders us susceptible of true greatness; but as pride leads to a dangerous self-complacency and satisfaction with ourselves, humility by exhibiting true greatness to us, by showing us our great distance from it, by pointing out to us the deceitfulness of the heart, awakens a desire in us to be freed from our sinfulness and a striving after something more noble.

I shall now show, in the second place, that it can not be expected to be otherwise than that pride and perverted self-love, shall be in the way of a moral change, and that humility on the other hand should not only be the beginning of such a change, but also lead it in its progress, and watch over it.

This will appear if we consider how pride and an irregular self-love judge of the motives of our actions. Our views, feelings, and manner of thinking are the fountain of all our actions; and the moral value of every action depends on the moral character of our motives. Selfish love always teaches us to put the best construction upon all that belongs to us; to make our impure motives, our selfish intentions, desires, passions and ignoble maxims appear better than they are; to excuse them by many pretexts and refuges; and to beautify them by giving them milder names, by calling tenderness what is voluptuousness; firmness of character what is obstinacy; economy what is parsimony; prudence what is a calculating selfishness or craft-

iness; justice what is cruelty; a sense of duty what is a feeling of revenge, and zeal what is personal animosity.

Thus continuing to deceive ourselves, we shall soon reach the highest point of security, where we shall no longer suspect ourselves, but blinded by a selfish love, commit all kinds of crimes and indulge every weakness without any remorse of conscience. Then we will neither notice the danger and temptation which accompany external impressions upon us, nor flee the opportunity of doing evil; nor shun the snares which are strewed around us by passions, by habits, by society, by combinations of circumstances, by the bustle of the world as well as by the silence of home. Every where we are exposed to dangers, and all that we possess is susceptible of being affected by them; the excitability of youth and the dullness of age; the zeal with which we undertake a benevolent scheme, and the caution with which we execute it;—all have their dangers and we must constantly be on our guard: but pride will never acknowledge this truth; even at the brink of an abyss it does not see it.

Humility, on the other hand, keeps constantly alive in us the consciousness of our weakness and frailty. It reminds us of every error we have committed, it represents to us how we have either neglected or violated a duty, have left works unfinished, failed in our plans, or have grown languid in our zeal. Humility acknowledges that we are selfish and inclined to act from impure motives. It says: "If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Thus humility awakens a just suspicion against ourselves; teaches us to shun all danger, to resist with resoluteness the first temptation, to be cautious in every thing, and watch over our hearts, and give an account of every impression that old or new acquaintances, known or unknown, near or distant objects and circumstances make upon us. It is humility, that inclines our ears to listen to every advice; that makes us grateful for every admonition of friends or enemies, that disposes us to ask for the assistance of all

in whom we confide, in the work of our santification. Thus watching ourselves and asking others to watch over us, we will grow in virtue and piety, and yet ascribe all honor not to ourselves, but to Christ; for all the aid we receive, every word, that warns us and protects us from worldly influence, we regard as the signs of divine care and goodness.

Selfish pride cannot lead to moral greatness, because it bribes us in estimating the importance of our actions, and thus causes us to be satisfied when we ought to feel grief and a desire to become better. The Pharisee fasts twice a week and pays the tenth of all he has; these actions are externally good enough, but they are or may be mere ceremonies, mere forms without the spirit that once produced them; if fasting awakens self-satisfaction, or a feeling that we were doing something praiseworthy, or pride, it will be more sinful, than if eating we feel that we have no merit. Pride and self-love, however, place an unqualified value upon all we do, and the same action, which would appear to us insignificant in others, becomes important in us. A man may have many good and amiable traits in his character and still be one of the most despicable sinners, but pride sees only the former and does not take notice of the latter. These good qualities pride keeps in remembrance; upon them it concentrates all our thoughts; by them it assauges our conscience, when it should be roused; and though we may entertain pride and envy and a spirit of revenge, though we may practice all kinds of injustice and be given to an unbridled avarice or ambition—all this pride does not notice, but boasts of being punctual in attending on what it calls duties, of always observing decency, being friendly and polite to all with whom it has intercourse. Pride, we can see it clearly, trusts in works and self-righteousness.

Humility, on the other hand, is never satisfied with any work we do, or with any action that might appear good before the world. Surrounded by the light of grace the feelings of our unworthiness must daily grow stronger, our desire for divine assistance greater, our repentance on ac-

count of sin more sincere. "But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ; yea doubtless and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things and do count them but dung that I may win Christ and be found in him not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." Selfish pride places its hope upon its own actions, it needs no Saviour, not His assistance in life, nor His aid in our attempts to purify our hearts. But humility acknowledges in Christ all purifying power; it looks up to Him in every danger; receives from Him the impulse to good resolutions and the power to execute them; whether we need help against men, or misfortune, or against our own deceitful heart, Christ gives it to the humble. "I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me."

Selfish pride can not lead to honored greatness, because it perverts our judgment concerning the applause and reproach which we may receive from our fellow men. Selfish pride induces us to explain both praise and reproach so that by the former *more* is meant than was said, and by the latter *less*. Applause and praise may become dangerous even for the cautious and for him that is above adulation and flattery, yet he who has a high opinion of himself will naturally expect every one else to share it, and consequently never distrust the sincerity of praise, and often consider words spoken without any design at all, as intended for his praise. On the other hand, he will think it impossible to deserve reproach or a reprimand. Whatever may be intended as such by parents, or teachers, or friends, is an offense, an insult offered to the aspiring mind; the most excellent remarks, the wisest advice, the most reasonable admonitions, will not instruct, but only embitter him; not convice him, but only excite his indignation; they will not correct, but only confirm him in his mistaken views.

Humility, on the contrary, seeks not for applause nor

for the signs of honor—titles and orders—in whatever way they might be obtained, and however honorable they might be as the testimony of public opinion concerning ourselves; it seeks for the appproval of God and for the testimony of a good conscience. It looks upon mere earthly honor as vanity, and does not suffer itself to be led off, by the applause of men, from a true knowledge of the state and condition of our hearts.

Selfish pride, finally, induces us to judge of our fellowmen so that we gain by a comparison with them. To see what we are, we must look upon others and see what they are, and to know them we must look into our own heart. Alone and entirely alone, no one would be able to become acquainted with himself. But pride does not suffer us to compare ourselves with those who are better than we, but with those whom we think to be worse than ourselves, with robbers, extortioners, adulterers, publicans. Before making the comparison we are certain already of a victory; and if sometimes we meet with some excellencies in others that we do not possess, we know how to detract from their moral value so much that they come down to a level with our own. Others, we say, may appear to be better, but they are not;—their temper, their coolness, their natural disposition, their cold constitution, or their circumstances, education and habits are such as make it impossible to commit certain faults; hence it is not their merit, if they do not really commit them. Thus we must always appear better than others and will be ready to exclaim: I thank thee, God, that I am not as other men.

Humility, on the other hand, points out as the proper object of comparison not one of our fellowmen, but Christ our Saviour—His life, so richly adorned with all good works, His sufferings and death, so beautifully evincing His Divine love and holiness. Christ is the ideal of all the endeavors of an humble Christian; all He does, however great it may appear before the world, will be insignificant and sinful when compared with what Christ has done, whose only meat and drink it was to do the will of His

Father, who spent His life and His strength for us, who like the sun, spread joy and happiness wherever He came; who considered no work too low, no labor too disgusting. The humble Christian that compares his life with Christ, looks upon His perfections as the highest aim of his wishes, and perceiving the great distance between his imperfection and Christ's perfection, he, relying on divine grace, feels himself excited, and his strength revived, his zeal increased, and can not consent to consider any stage in his resemblance to Christ a proper resting place. The hope, however, of reaching the mark at last, does not only spur him on, but also renders him willing to undergo all deprivations, and resign all the pleasares of the world that would impede his progress. Like the traveller whose intention it is to ascend a mountain for the purpose of enjoying a glorious sunset; the day is hot; his road leads him through meadows with many rivulets; green grass benches invite him to sit down and rest himself; but he keeps the end of his journey in view and walks on. The road leads him through beautiful groves; the shade of trees, the song of birds, the cool, refreshing breezes that play with the rustling branches invite him to sit down, but he keeps the end in view; he walks on until he reaches the summit of the mountain. Thence he looks back upon the road he came; the many meadows and groves lie before him a smiling landscape and he enjoys the view with intense delight. So will the humble Christian not rest in his progress towards the ideal of perfection; no pleasure, nor self-satisfaction; nor any advantageous comparison of himself with others is able to allure his eye and take it away from the end of the journey of his life, always saying: "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus; forgetting those things which are behind, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

In conclusion, let us draw a few inferences from the subject before us. And the first which I would make is this:

Whenever we feel no kind of uneasiness concerning the state of our souls or concerning our character, when we are perfectly satisfied, then we are truly in danger. There is no one who has not to exclaim every day in more than one respect: God be merciful to me a sinner. If any one should nevertheless be able to say: I thank thee, Lord, that I am better than other men, he would deceive himself. In proportion as we advance in virtue, we will see the ideal of all greatness more distinctly and perceive how infinitely far off we are from it. The more tender the conscience grows by a holy desire to be good, the more odious will even the smallest offense appear. Hence any one that is satisfied with himself, is in the greatest danger of being lost forever, nor will he ever become morally great, but will be less so than those that acknowledge their sins.

Another inference I would draw from our subject is this:

Let us closely examine those qualities in us, which selfish pride induces us to consider praiseworthy and good. Every one will value some good qualities, in some advantages or actions, especially if early education has had a tendency to direct his mind upon them. On account of them we will be inclined to consider ourselves good. My advice is, that we should suspect these qualities and examine most accurately into their real moral nature. The apostle says: "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." If you now either look with pleasure upon your orthodoxy, or your religious exercises, or your honor before men or upon any virtue, and discover any degree of selfishness in them, or the absence of love from all of them, or if you discover by the side of those as many frailties—your high opinion of yourselves will soon sink and assume the proper position. Instead of being proud, we will feel ashamed, instead of claiming any merit, we will feel guilty; instead of considering our actions good, we will find them to be full of sin, if we judge of them by the same light in which they will once be viewed by our judge. Such an examination will press the words to our lips: God be merciful to me a sinner.

ART. IX.—ANALYTIC ORTHOGRAPHY.

ANALYTIC ORTHOGRAPHY: An Investigation of the Sounds of the Voice and their Alphabetic Notation; including the Mechanism of Speech, and its bearing upon Etymology. By S. S. Haldeman, A. M. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. London: Trübner & Co. Paris: B. Duprat. Berlin: F. Dümmler. 1860. pp. 148.

Speech is older than writing and is the true form of language. Before Cadmus invented letters men knew no other medium for the communication of their ideas, and even now, of the thousand and one languages and dialects in existence a large proportion remain unwritten. In reading with the eye there is always an undercurrent of sound audible within, for, by a strange psychological inversion, the eye, for the time being, performs the office of an ear, so that the harmonious numbers of the poet give pleasure and harsh and discordant sentences offend, just as much as if they had been uttered.

Language, therefore, is essentially phonetic, and words and letters are symbols of sounds. But unfortunately a wide difference has come to prevail between what is written and what is spoken, adding greater confusion to the confusion of Babel, for not only do different nations employ different characters to represent the same sounds, but the same characters to represent different sounds. To an Italian the beautiful stanzas of Tasso's Jerusalem Delivered read aloud by an uninstructed Englishman would sound, to say the least, like an abominable travesty, and if Virgil were permitted to return from the shades and listen to the Æneid, treated in similar fashion as it is in our modern colleges and schools, he would no doubt take it for the unintelligible jargon of some barbarian tribe and fail to recognize the progeny of his own brain. Besides this, the same letters and syllables in the same language have often

not two, but several, conflicting phonetic values. And then, also, we have disputes in regard to pronunciation, and accent, emphasis and intonation, in endless variety, not represented by signs of any kind.

To trace up these diversities to their true causes, historical and natural—to reduce the chaos to order by a thorough "investigation of the sounds of the voice and the mechanism of speech"—and thence to construct, on a philosophical and logical basis, a system of *universal alphabetic notation*, which shall retain all that is good in the old modes and add nothing with the rash hand of innovation, is surely an object worthy of the noblest effort. Some attempts of the kind have already been made, but none which can at all equal the work whose title stands at the head of this brief article. It is original in the best sense of the word. Prof. Haldeman has brought to the task peculiar qualifications in habits of accurate analysis, acquired in the life-long pursuit of the physical sciences. The phases of speech as yet known or detached facts are *accounted for* by him and referred to physical laws. Wisely, as we think, he has selected the Latin alphabet as the ground-work of his system of notation. His conclusions are not the results of whim or fancy, but of patient and careful study, of an ardent search after the immutable laws which govern the manifold changes of speech. Hence we regard his essay as a permanent contribution to the stock of the world's knowledge, and such also seems to be the judgment of the English Committee who awarded it the Trevelyan Prize of one hundred guineas.

The advantages of creating and adopting a truly scientific and philosophical system of alphabetic notation must be evident on a little reflection. Like the notes of music, its characters would have the same phonetic value all the world over. A speech once recorded could not then wholly die, even though the race that used it should perish from the face of the earth. Indeed, a lost tongue, as treasures by the bell of the diver, could be in a great measure recovered by its help. A treatise on Latin Pronunciation,

published some years ago by the author of the Trevelyan Prize Essay and favorably noticed in the pages of this Review, shows what can be done in the way of such resuscitation.

A most formidable obstacle, which has hitherto impeded the progress of comparative philology, would cease to exist, for the student could then obtain a photograph, so to speak, of any living language as it really is, and delivered from the bondage of the letter, which in this case also too often killeth, correct a thousand errors into which he had fallen and avoid a thousand mistakes into which he might have fallen.

Missionaries among the heathen would be furnished, ready at hand, with an alphabet, by means of which they could transfer with a great saving of time and labor the unwritten languages of the natives from their lips to paper and at once render them available for use, not only to those for whom the printed page was primarily intended, but also to the scholars and learned societies of all nations.

Although it should be finally decided by the jealous guardians of the "pure well of English undefiled" that a phonetic reform of the orthography of our mother-tongue is neither practicable nor desirable, such a universal alphabet would do an invaluable service in replacing the puzzling conglomeration of vowels and consonants usually appended to words in our dictionaries, according to the individual caprice of the compiler. Nothing would tend more to preserve purity of speech than an accurate and convenient key of this kind. Foreigners would then have a standard for their own pronunciation and a sure guide to the physiognomy of words as spoken by the natives.

In this modern age, when the barriers that obstruct intercourse between nations are rapidly disappearing, one by one, before the march of Christian civilization and the ends of the earth are brought together through the combined agencies of steam and electricity, a uniform mode of representing languages has become a matter of urgent practical necessity. Professor Haldeman well remarks:

"As the present tendency of science in general is to adopt standards of universal application, and it is usual for learned societies and associations, to have a permanent committee of research, consultation, and correspondence, with a view to bring about a uniformity of weights, measures, and coinage, so the advance of linguistic science demands a uniform nomenclature and notation for the phases of speech, so that the same syllable may be written in the same manner, wherever there is occasion to use it, just as every known plant and insect is recognized by a uniform Latin name by all who are familiar with botany and entomology."

It may be doubted whether the system of linguistic notation has yet been brought to such a pitch of perfection as to render it worthy of universal adoption, as the symbols of Berzelius in the sphere of chemistry. The world too, progressive as it is, is always somewhat slow in abandoning an old, beaten track, to which it has long been accustomed, even for a new and better way. But the time will come and that in no remote era of the future, when all that is here hoped for and struggled after will be successfully accomplished, and then the labors of the pioneers who cleared away the rubbish and laid the broad foundations will be rightly appreciated. Among the names of these pioneers, we are confident, that of the author of the Trevelyan Prize Essay will shine with honor.

T. C. P.

Art. X.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Recent Enquiries in Theology, by eminent English Churchmen; being "Essays and Reviews." Reprinted from the second London edition. Edited with an Introduction, by Rev. Frederic H. Hedge, D. D. Boston: Walker, Wise and Co. 1860. pp. 480.

The spirit of this anomolous production, by certain eminent English Churchmen, though possessing great literary merit, we can not characterize more fittingly, nor in fewer words, than by citing two notorious facts in history. The one occurred in the time of David. "When Abner was returned to Hebron, Joab took him aside in the gate to speak with him quietly, and smote him there under the fifth rib, that he died." The other fact occurred in the time of David's Son and Lord. "Behold a multitude, and he that was called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them, and drew near unto Jesus to kiss him. But Jesus said unto him, *Betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss.*"

There is a strong infidel tendency openly at work in the Church of England. Men who have received holy orders at her hands, who live upon her bounty, and fill high places of trust, are combining, under the guise of devotion to truth, to undermine and destroy the faith which they have sworn to teach and defend. E. V. G.

Grand Illustrated Encyclopedia of Animated Nature. Being a complete History of the Animal Kingdom, by John Frost, LL. D.

Works upon the Animal Kingdom are generally too elaborate and scientific for popular use, being adapted rather to the critical student of Natural History than to the people generally. This fact has led the author to prepare a work designed for the Home and Fireside. Technical words and phrases are carefully avoided; such terms only being used as are easily understood by the general reader. It abounds in illustrations; there being no less than thirteen hundred and fifty engravings. This is a very prominent feature of the work.

The book is instructive, interesting and attractive; and can not but be very acceptable to the class of readers for which it is particularly designed. E. V. G.

Handbuch der Christlichen Sittenlehre von Adolf Wuttke, Dr. d. Philos. u. Theol. und ausserordentl. Prof. an der Univ. Berlin. Erster Band. Berlin: Wiegandt & Grieben. 1861.

This is, as far as we know, the most elaborate system of Christian Ethics which has appeared since the great work of Dr. Rothe of Heidelberg. Dr. Wuttke belongs to the rising generation of German divines. He first distinguished himself by a valuable History of Heathenism, of which two volumes were published a few years ago (1852 and '53). He was then lecturer of philosophy in the University of Breslau, but soon afterwards exchanged the philosophical for the theological profession at the University of Berlin, and was recently transferred to Halle as ordinary professor.

About one half of this volume (300 pages) is taken up with a general introduction, and a very full history of Ethics among the Chinese, the Hindoos, the Greeks, the Romans, the Hebrews, and the Christians down to Schleiermacher and Rothe. Then follows the first part which treats of the ethical principles and relations without reference to sin. We may refer to the work more fully when it shall be completed. P. S.

Zeitschrift fuer die historische Theologie. In Verbindung mit der von C. F. Illgen gegründeten historisch-theologishen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig herausgegeben von Dr. theol. Christ. Wilh. Niedner in Berlin. Jahrgang 1861. Gotha: Fr. Andr. Perthes. 1861.

This quarterly periodical is exclusively devoted to historical theology, and contains elaborate and minute articles on subjects which are not yet sufficiently cleared up. For the professional historian it is of great value. The October number, which concludes the last volume, has already come to hand through the prompt agency of Westermeier & Co., of New York. The principal articles of the volume for 1861 are: 1) The Persecutions of the Christians in Persia during the fourth and fifth centuries, by Dr. Uhlemann. This article takes up the whole of the first quarterly number. 2) Contributions to the History of Protestant Sects in the Church of Hesse, by

Hochhut. 3) The Outbreak of the first French religious War in 1562, by Dr. Ebrard of Speier (now again of Erlangen). 4) A new manuscript of Eusebius' Church History in Moscow, by Dr. Muralt. 5) The Controversy on the alleged Platonism of the Fathers, by Dr. Stein. 6) Elector John Casimir of the Palatinate in conflict with the Form of Concord, by Dr. Johannsen. 7) A Waldensian Translation and Exposition of the Song of Songs, translated from a manuscript in Geneva by Dr. Herzog (the editor of the Theol. Encyclopaedia. 8) Thirty unpublished Letters of Luther and Melanchthon and some contemporaries, communicated by Baxmann.

P. S.

Kritisch-praktischer Commentar ueber das Neue Testament. Von Dr. Wilhelm Nast. Achte Lieferung. Cincinnati: Verlag von Poe & Hitchcock 1861.

We have just received the eighth number of this Commentary which extends to Matthew 27, v. 1–10. One more number will no doubt complete the Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew and make a large volume of nearly 600 pages. The fact that this is the first *German* Commentary ever written or published in America is already sufficient to clothe it with some interest and importance. But it is really a very creditable work as to learning, spirit and style, and need not be ashamed to show its face even in Germany, the prolific soil of learned commentaries on the Scriptures. Dr. Nast has undertaken a most extensive, difficult and responsible task, and we sincerely hope that the Lord may give him health and strength to carry it to a successful completion. The large sale with which the work has met among the German Methodists of this country, speaks very well for the zeal and liberality of this new branch of German Christianity. P. S

Manuel du Libraire et de l'amateur de livres contenant un nouveau dictionaire bibliographique. Par Jacques-Charles Brunet, chevalier de la légion d'honneur. Cinquième édition entièrement refondue et augmentée d'un tiers. Paris: Firmin Didot Freres. Tome premier et deuxième. 1860.

We have received from Paris, through John Penington & Son, Philadelphia, the first volume in two parts, and the first part of

the second volume of this work now in course of publication. It is a new and greatly enlarged edition of a standard work for librarians, bibliographers, and bibliophilists, which appeared first in 1809. It is to embrace, when completed, six large volumes, each in two parts, at a cost of 100 francs, or about $20 for subscribers, and 120 francs in the regular trade. It contains, in the alphabetical order of the authors, a list of the most esteemed works in every language and every branch of literature since the invention of the art of printing, a history of the different editions with the prices, and descriptions and occasional illustrations of rare and costly books. The first part of volume second completes the letter D. This work is as reliable and complete for general purposes as can be desired. But it can not supersede other works devoted to special languages or special branches of literature, such as Lowndes' *Biographical Manual of English Literature* (new and enlarged edition by Bohn, now nearly completed), and Winer's *Handbuch der theologischen Literatur*.

P. S.

Thoughts on Preaching, being Contributions to Homiletics. By James W. Alexander, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner. 1861.

A posthumous work of the late lamented Dr. James W. Alexander, one of the best men whom America has produced. Had the author lived to prepare it for the press himself, it would, of course, be far more complete and satisfactory. But even in its present fragmentary state it is a valuable contribution to practical theology and worthy of a careful perusal. It abounds in sound views and useful hints on the subject of preaching. The editor (a brother of the author) has incorporated in this volume several articles on the same subject which were previously published in the "Princeton Review," and a series of letters to young ministers, which appeared first in the "Presbyterian" of Philadelphia. Thus the volume contains all that Dr. Alexander has written on the subject of Homiletics. One article treats of the French Pulpit under Louis XIV and gives a judicious estimate of the merits of Bossuet, Bourdaloue and Massillon.

P. S.

History of Latin Christianity; including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicolas V. By Henry Hart Milman, D. D., Dean of St. Paul's. In eight volumes. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1861.

This elegant reprint of Milman's History of Latin Christianity, which equals the English in beauty of paper and typography, and excels it in neatness and convenience of size, is now completed. Of the merits of the work we have spoken in a previous number of the Review. It is a full history of Latin Christianity or of the Christianity of Europe during the middle ages to the reconstruction of the power of the papacy under Nicolas the fifth (who died in 1455). It is the most important English work on general Church history since Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, and has already taken a permanent place among the English classics. We only regret that the author did not carry the history down to the pontificate of Leo X. and the threshhold of the Reformation which marks the end of the middle ages and the beginning of the modern era of Christianity.

P. S.

A Text book of the History of Doctrines. By Dr. K. R. Hagenbach, Prof. of Theol in the University of Basle. The Edinburgh translation of C. W. Buch, revised with large additions from the fourth German edition, and other sources. By Henry B. Smith, D. D., Prof. in the Union Theol. Seminary (N. S. Presbyt.) of the city of New York. Vol. I. New York: Sheldon & Co., 115 Nassau St. 1861.

Dr. Hagenbach's *Dogmengeschichte* has passed through four editions in Germany. Of all the recent works on this important branch of Church history it is deservedly the most popular and best adapted to English and American use. Buch's English translation (Edinburgh, 1846) is based on the first edition of the original (1841), and was subsequently revised from the second edition (1848). Prof. H. B. Smith, so favorably known as the reviser of Davidson's Gieseler and the author of an original Church history in tabular form, has laid the theological public under new obligations by sending forth a revised translation of Hagenbach's doctrine history. This edition embodies all the improvements and additions of the third and fourth editions of the original, together with citations from other au-

thors and references to the more recent German, as well as English and American literature on the subject, especially the doctrinal histories of Gieseler (1855), Neander (edited by Jacobi, 1858), and Baur (second edition, 1858). These additions increase the matter of the volume about one third. The new matter found in Hagenbach, is uniformly indicated by brackets.

In view of these facts we do not hesitate to give this revised translation the preference even to the original. Dr. Smith does all his work with scholarly accuracy and thoroughness, literary skill and taste. But the printer has made many mistakes, especially in the Greek and German quotations and names. We hope that the troubles of the times may not prevent the speedy completion of the second volume, which will bring the history of the doctrinal development of Christianity from the Reformation down to the present time. We would also respectfully suggest to Dr. Smith to enrich the second volume with a full history of the doctrinal theology of England and America, with which German authors are far less acquainted than with the most obscure period of Greek and Latin Christianity. Nor has any English writer filled up this vacuum in the modern history of Christian doctrines. We venture to say that such an addition would be most thankfully received in Germany also, and hereafter be made use of as a source by Hagenbach and subsequent writers on *Dogmengeschichte.*

Of the importance of this branch of theological study Prof. Smith, at the close of the preface, makes the following just remarks: "Among all the branches of theological study, the History of Doctrines has been the most neglected in the general course of instruction in our theological schools. There are not wanting some healthful indications of an increasing sense of its value and importance. Without it, neither the history of the Church, nor the history of philosophy, nor the present phases and conflicts of religious belief, can be thoroughly appreciated. It gives us the real internal life of the Church. It renders important aid in testing both error and truth. It may guard against heresy, while it also confirms our faith in those essential articles of the Christian faith, which have been the best heritage of the Church. In the fluctuations of human opinion, the History of Doctrines shows the immutability and progress of divine truth." P. S.

THE UNION FOREVER, THE SOUTHERN REBELLION AND THE WAR FOR THE UNION. A History of the Rise and Progress of the

Rebellion and conservative Narrative of Events and Incidents, from the first stages of the treason against the Republic, down to the close of the Conflict, together with important documents, extracts from remarkable speeches, etc., etc. New York: James D. Torrey, Publisher, N. 13, Spruce St. Sold by all booksellers and newsdealers. General Agent: Fred. Gerhard (Post Box 4001) New York. Published every Wednesday. Ten cents per number.

We have received three numbers of this timely and useful publication, which will no doubt have a large sale. It is impossible to keep all the newspapers, pamphlets and speeches, now falling as thick as leaves in Vallombrosa, on the present eventful period of American history. Hence the importance of such a periodical publication proposing to present for permanent use, in chronological order and consecutive narrative, a running history of the stirring events from the last Presedential election to the close of this most remarkable rebellion which ever occurred in ancient or modern history. Such a collection of well authenticated facts and documents must prove of invaluable use to the future American Clarendon, and will save him immense labor and time. The first three numbers are well executed, and justify a commendation of the work to all who feel an interest in this great contest of the age. We would prefer if the name of a responsible author was given. Is it Professor Schem, lately of Dickinson College, Carlisle? If so, he need not be ashamed of giving publicity to it. For he is admirably qualified for such a task.

A work of the kind can, of course, not be regarded as a history proper, but simply as a *collection of material* for a future history. The human mind takes up things consecutively, and must wait for the final results before it can form a proper estimate of any historical movement. "By the fruits ye shall know them:" this holds good also in its application to history. Our greatest statesmen, including Mr. Seward, have already shown the short-sightedness and folly of all human wisdom, in their miscalculations about the probable issue of our late political complications. No man can tell what even to-morrow may bring forth. We have no doubt that Providence has secret designs in this crisis of our nation, which lie beyond the present reach of the most sagacious statesmen, but which will unfold themselves gradually before our astonished vision. At present God uses the South to punish the North, and the North

to punish the South for their sins; but after he has sufficiently humbled the whole nation, he will bless us and overrule even the wrath of man for his own glory. It will all come right in the end, and "all is well, that ends well." P. S.

A Proclamation of a Day of Humiliation, Fasting and Prayer by His Excellency, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America.

A day of humiliation, prayer and fasting, formally requested by a vote of both Houses of the national Congress, the highest representative and legislative body under the Constitution, and solemnly proclaimed by the President of the United States, then confirmed and recommended by Governors, Mayors, and City Councils, is an act of the nation acknowledging God, His supreme authority over human affairs, His universal Government and special Providence; acknowledging its entire dependence upon His power and blessing, its accountability to the authority of His holy law, its innumerable transgressions and great guilt; acknowledging Him also as the only Source of deliverance from the terrible scourge of civil war, with which Divine displeasure has smitten the land to the ground. Such an appointment of the day by *Congress* and the President is itself an act of national repentance—an open turning away from human strength, human wisdom and resources, to the living God as the only ground of hope.

The act acquires significance from the peculiar position and character of the American nation. The sin peculiar to the United States, is not slavery; although, since the abolition of serfdom by the Emperor of Russia, we are the only civilized and Christian people whose Constitution tolerates and protects a system of bondage. But the sin which has marked the American Republic from its origin down to the present time, is a *proud* and *godless* spirit. We speak of the Government, or of the theory which is actualized in our Republican institutions, and not of the people as a whole, much less of the large number of religious people. The *theory* of government, and the institutions it has established, however wise and good, nevertheless combine two fatal elements: *pride* and *godlessness*. Two elements we may call them; but they are in fact only two aspects of one deep-rooted evil. To repose our whole trust in our own will and strength, to regard ourselves as superior in wisdom, talent, and energy to all other nations, and our *own*

mental and material resources as fully equal to any emergency, whether arising from domestic discord or foreign foes, is in the very act to refuse to put our trust in the arm of God and to ignore His Providence and even His being.

We admit that the Federal Constitution, 1787, is in many respects, the ripest fruit of the political wisdom of the world, and should be sustained by the blood and treasure of the nation; but we can not but think that it is the wisdom of the *world*, rather than of God. The world by its wisdom does not know God. 1 Cor. 1: 21. The Federal Constitution does not know God. It does not directly acknowledge even the being of God by whom "the powers that be" are ordained; much less the obligation of a Republican Government to the law and authority of God; less still does it recognize any subordination or relation of the State to Jesus Christ, by whose mediation "every good gift, and every perfect gift" comes down "from the Father of lights" upon individuals and nations. The oath or affirmation to be taken by the President elect before he enter on the execution of his office, (Art. II. Sect 8) and required of all Senators and Representatives, and of all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, (Art. VI. Sect. 3), involves the idea of God, by implication, and supposes the accountability of the individual to God; but it does not imply the dependence of civil government upon divine authority, nor of national prosperity upon the divine favor and blessing. "We, *the people*, do ordain and establish this Constitution," is the key-note of the instrument, otherwise so deserving of veneration, confidence and support. The latter clause of Sect. 3. Art. VI., which says that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust" implies the fact of religion existing in the land, but implies no obligation of Government to its authority; on the contrary it teaches that neither religious faith nor religious character, for the one is the foundation of the other, forms any part of the qualifications of a man for any office of public trust.

There is no direct hostility to religion in the Constitution, nor was it designed by its framers to be derogatory to the claims of Christian truth; yet its negative character, has had a direct tendency, if not to beget, at least to develop and strengthen a proud, self-reliant, boastful and humanitarian spirit in the nation. The governments of other Christian peoples, stand and rule professedly by *the Grace of God*, but the American Republic, ignoring with the rejection of monarchical

institutions the only foundation also of all civil authority, reposes trust in no higher power than that of *the people.*

This is the peculiar sin of the American Republic—the root of various forms of evil in the administration and operation of the Government; and must be the object of the sore displeasure, and if not repented of, the condign punishment of Almighty God. Already have the heavy strokes of His wrath fallen in terror upon us. He is breaking the nation with a rod of iron; and dashing it in peices like a potter's vessel. The national Congress recognizes the divine hand in our deep distress, and asks the President to call upon the people to humble themselves before His Throne of grace, and pray for His gracious interposition and blessing. In this act Congress rises above the negative spirit of the Constitution; and looking away from the help of "the people," raises its heart in penitence and faith to Him who holds the nation in His fist. Thus humbling ourselves, there is hope. But if the American Republic would be permanently established among the nations of the earth, it must acknowledge the Lord as its God. The great defect of Federal and State Constitutions must be remedied. "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling."

E. V. G.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Alumni Association for the year 1861.

LANCASTER, Pa.

The Association convened according to call at 5 o'clock, P. M., Tuesday, July 23rd, 1861, in the main room of Fulton Hall, immediately at the close of the Biennial Address.

The regular chairman not being present, Dr. L. H. Steiner, of Frederick city, Md., was chosen speaker *pro tem.*

On motion the Society adjourned until eight o'clock, P. M., to the lecture room of the First German Reformed church.

The Society met pursuant to adjournment and opened with prayer by the Rev. S. H. Giesy of Philadelphia.

On motion, the graduating class being present, they were admitted to membership on complying with the standing regulations of the constitution.

On motion the Association proceeded to business, and the matter of the Mercersburg Review was first taken up. In the absence of a report from the publisher, after an animated discussion on the expedience and manner of its continuance, participated in by Dr. Wm. Maybury, Hon. John Cessna, Dr. Gerhart, Prof. Appel, Revs. Wagner, (J. H.), Giesy, Wissler, T. P. Bucher and others, the following resolution offered by the Rev. J. O. Miller of York, Pa., was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That a committee of six be appointed to close the accounts of the Association with the present publisher, Rev. Geo. B. Russell; that the committee be authorized to offer to Mr. Russell a continuance of the present arrangement for the term of two years, according to the conditions of our contract—and should he refuse the offer, that the committee be clothed with plen-

ary powers to carry on the Review in the name of the Association for one year, i. e., A. D., 1862.

The committee was constituted as follows: Rev. Dr. Gerhart, Rev. Prof. Appel, Wilberforce Nevin, Rev. J. O. Miller, Dr, Wm. Maybury and Dr. L. H. Steiner.

The chairman of the quarter-centenary catalogue committee reported, that they had prepared nothing for publication on account of the failure of the conditions precedent to their action, viz: the Literary Societies of Franklin and Marshall College co-operating financially. They deem this inexpedient at present. (Committee, W. Nevin, Rev. J. O. Miller, G. W. Ruby, Esq.) The report was received, adopted and the committee continued without any specific instructions.

On motion of Hon. John Cessna of Bedford, it was

Resolved, That the earnest attention of the individual members of this Association be called to the importance of making special exertions to procure the attendance of students at Franklin and Marshall College—and that each member feel himself bound to raise at least one new student for the Institution.

No report being presented by the committee appointed last year to memorialize the Board of Trustees of the College to extend the exercises of commencement week over Thursday, in order to give the Association some adequate time for the dignified transaction of its business and social intercourse, the committee was, on motion, continued with its former instructions. (Revs. G. B Russell, W. K. Zieber and D. Gans, committee.)

The following letter was read from Wm. H. Miller, Esq., of Harrisburg, Pa., Alumni orator for the year:

Wilberforce Nevin, Esq.,

Dear Sir—Your favor of the 20th inst., and of a former date, are at hand, asking as to the "subject of my address." *Your first inquiry was the earliest intimation that I had been designated by the Society to deliver such address.* If I was ever notified of the appointment, the communication did not reach me. In the hope that in the very short time allowed me I might prepare something that would enable me to meet the appointment, I did not answer your first letter. I now find it impossible to do so. I regret that for the reasons given I have not been able to avail myself of the high honor conferred on me by my fellow alumni.

If possible I will be with you in person. With sentiments of deep interest in the success of our Alma Mater and of personal regard for the members of the Association you represent, I am sincerely your friend, &c.,

Harrisburg, Pa., July 23rd, 1861. W. H. MILLER.

The communication was received, ordered to be entered at large on the minutes, and *on motion* Mr. Miller was unanimously elected Orator the coming year.

The Association then went into an election for officers for the ensuing year, resulting as follows:

For President, L. H. Steiner, M. D., Frederick, Md.; Vice Presidents, Rev. S. H. Giesy, Philadelphia, Pa., Rev. T. P. Bucher, Gettysburg, Pa.; Corresponding Secretary, John H. Wagner, Hagerstown, Md.; Recording Secretary, Wilberforce Nevin, Lancaster, Pa.; Treasurer, Wm. Leamon, Esq., Lancaster, Pa.

On motion the officers of the Association were constituted a committee to prepare a supper at the next meeting.

The committee appointed to revise and remodel the constitution reported, that in their opinion the work would be fruitless, that the members, not the constitution, needed changing. Report received.

On motion of Mr. Maybury, it was resolved that a full and official copy of the minutes of the year be published in the Mercersburg Review.

Minutes read and adopted and closed with prayer by Rev. J. H. Wagner. Adjourned.

LEWIS H. STEINER, *President.*

WILBERFORCE NEVIN, *Secretary.*

3 1198 04015 0992
N/1198/04015/0992X

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

Periodical

3 1198 04015 0992
N/1198/04015/0992X